

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

VOL. XVIII.—OCTOBER, 1893.—No. 72.

THE LIMITS OF PAPAL INFALLIBILITY.

IN presuming to present a few considerations on the above heading, it is not my intention to minimize, but rather to define, the extent of papal infallibility. I do not assume the task of proving the dogma of the infallibility. I take it for granted, and suppose it to be a revealed truth, which all Catholics are bound to believe, as defined by the Vatican Council in the following terms :

“The Roman Pontiff, when he speaks *ex cathedra*, that is, when discharging the office of pastor and teacher of all Christians, in virtue of his supreme apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine on faith or morals, to be held by the universal Church, by the divine assistance promised to him in blessed Peter, possesses that infallibility with which the divine Redeemer wished His Church to be endowed in the definition of doctrine regarding faith or morals ; and therefore the definitions of the Roman Pontiff are of themselves, and not owing to the consent of the Church, irreformable.”¹

Here there is manifestly question of doctrinal, not moral, infallibility—not by impeccability, omniscience, inspiration, revelation or other supernatural or preternatural gift, but in virtue of the divine assistance, which under certain conditions, according to the promise of the Saviour, infallibly secures the supreme pastor of all the faithful from error in teaching and expounding Christ's doctrine. For those who, through affected ignorance or malice, would still persist in interpreting papal infallibility as sinlessness, or as universal political sway over the Christian and non-Christian world, or as an apotheosis of the Pope, or as anything else than doctrinal inerrancy in a certain capacity and under certain ad-

¹ *Const. de Ecclesia*, c. 4.

juncts,—for such I have not a word to lose. My sole task will be, as far as possible, to establish the limits of papal infallibility from the tenor of the definition itself. In so doing I do not pretend to produce anything new; but I trust to be able to make an old truth better understood to some by bringing within small compass, and presenting in intelligible form, much that is only to be found scattered through many bulky volumes of Latin.

The limits as well as the extent of papal infallibility, as contained in the Vatican definition, may be determined from four different heads.

1. From the *intention of the sovereign Pontiff or the capacity* in which he pronounces his decisions or definitions.
2. From the *person or persons to whom* such decisions or definitions are directly or indirectly addressed.
3. From the *subject-matter* of such papal utterances.
4. From the *form* in which they are couched.

I.

First, I say, certain conditions are required on the part of the Pope personally. He must speak as the teacher and pastor of all the faithful, and have the intention of defining *ex cathedra*. The Pope as a private individual or private teacher is not infallible. Accordingly he is not infallible in his private conversation, or in preaching to the people, or in lecturing on theological matters, or writing books on sacred subjects. Neither is he infallible in solving doubts of conscience for individuals, or for special classes or communities in particular cases. Discourses, dissertations, books, private decisions, pronounced or written by a Pope must certainly have a very high theological authority, owing to the exalted position, august character, and rare facilities of their author, as have, for instance, the learned works of Benedict XIV.; yet they can put no claim to infallibility, since the Pope in those cases acts in the capacity of a private teacher. In order that the Pope's utterances may be infallible, he must act in his *official capacity* as the supreme and authentic teacher of all the faithful. His utterance must be official and authoritative.

Nor is this enough. The Pope must have the *intention of binding the whole Church*. For if he speaks only as a father, friend or adviser, who gives good counsel without any intention of imposing an obligation, though his official capacity may appear in his utterance, yet such pronouncements are not *ex cathedra*, since they do not of themselves impose the duty of believing upon the faithful. Though such utterances are to be received with reverence, they are not infallible. The Pope must really intend to impose an *obligation*, not merely to give some directive advice.

But not every obligation is sufficient. No true Catholic will deny that the Pope intends to impose, and really imposes, an obligation on the whole Church by minor decisions and utterances that are not *ex cathedra*, and that the faithful are bound in conscience to give their *internal and religious assent* to such doctrinal decisions, though this assent may not, in all cases, be absolute and final, but only hypothetical and temporary—*i.e.*, with this restriction: unless, and until, the Church teaches, or permits to teach, otherwise. Such internal, religious, though conditional assent, we take it, was due to the decrees of the Inquisition in regard to the Copernican system, until the latter was scientifically established, and practically permitted by the Church—though the decrees of the Inquisition are not strictly pontifical decisions.

In order that a decree or decision may be *ex cathedra*, therefore, it is not enough that the Pope should intend to impose an obligation, but the obligation must be final, absolute, unchangeable. It must be such that no earthly court can repeal, amend, or reconsider it, except for the purpose of reaffirming it. In other words, the Pope must use "his *supreme apostolic authority*," he must use that absolute power of binding conferred upon him by Christ in the person of St. Peter as the universal teacher, ruler and pastor of the entire flock. Whatever he thus binds in virtue of his supreme power on earth is bound also in heaven; and no man has the power to loose it; consequently, his decrees thus issued are irreformable.

To sum up the conditions necessary on the part of the Pope, in order that his decisions may be *ex cathedra*, and therefore infallible, he must act, not as a private individual, but as the *authentic teacher* of all the faithful. He must not only act as an authentic teacher, but he must also intend to impose an *obligation of assent* on the faithful; and, moreover, this obligation must proceed from the *fulness of his apostolic authority*, and therefore be final and unconditional. *Roma locuta, causa finita est.*

II.

I said that the limits of papal infallibility may be determined also by the *person or persons to whom* his utterances are either directly or indirectly addressed. An *ex cathedra* definition may be addressed *directly* to one, or to many, or to the whole Church. It matters little to whom it is immediately directed, but *indirectly*, at least, it must be addressed to the *entire Church*, for it is only in the case in which he addresses the whole Church that the Pope acts as the "pastor and doctor of all Christians," and that he defines a truth "to be held by the whole Church." That it is not necessary that a definition *ex cathedra* should be *directly* addressed

to the whole Church is manifest from many examples. Thus, the Epistle of St. Leo the Great to Flavian is admitted by all theologians to be a dogmatic definition, although it is directly addressed to an individual. So, also, the Epistle of Pope Agatho on the two wills in Christ is addressed to the emperors of the east. And the Epistle of Celestine I. against the Semipelagians is directed to the bishops of Gaul. These documents, though addressed to one or a few, were intended as a rule of faith for the entire Church, and, being general authentic declarations of the Catholic faith, they could not but carry with them a universal obligation.

It does not follow, however, as we have already seen, that every doctrinal declaration issued by the Pope to the universal Church is an *ex cathedra* document, as the other conditions stated above must also be verified. Yet it must be borne in mind that encyclicals, allocutions, apostolic letters, and other papal utterances that are not *ex cathedra* often contain infallible truth, inasmuch as they propose with practical, moral certitude, doctrines that are of Catholic faith, and thus testify the belief of the entire body of the faithful and of the teaching Church. Thus, though we may not regard the encyclicals of Leo XIII. on *Christian Marriage* (February 10, 1880), for instance, or on the *Christian Constitution of States* (November 1, 1885), as *ex cathedra* utterances, yet we cannot deny that they practically *testify* with the most rigorous moral certitude the universal belief of the Church on many truths, and that they consequently supply on many points a practically infallible norm of Catholic belief. The same may be said of apostolic letters addressed to individuals, such as, for instance, the letter addressed by Leo XIII. to the Cardinal Vicar of Rome (June 26, 1878) on the necessity of Catholic schools for the education of Christian youth.

Besides, such declarations, whether addressed to individuals or to the entire Church, though not *ex cathedra* utterances, may, by the subsequent approval of the universal Church, become actually infallible documents, as the expression of the *consensus* of the entire teaching Church and of the belief of the faithful. As such we might regard a good number of the encyclicals, allocutions, and letters apostolic of Leo XIII. and Pius IX., abstracting from the question whether or not they are *ex cathedra* pronouncements, such was the unanimity with which these apostolic utterances have been received, taught, and believed by the entire Church. Now, the Vatican Council teaches us that we are to believe all those truths which are contained in Revelation, and which the Church proposes to our belief "whether by a solemn definition or by its *ordinary and universal teaching office*."¹ This ordinary and universal teach-

¹ Const. de fide, cap. 3.

ing office of the Church is the entire body of the bishops in union with the supreme pastor of all Christians. Wherever this *consensus* of the teaching Church is manifested, we have an infallible criterion of Catholic truth.

III.

We come now to the third and most important point for the determining of the limits or extent of papal infallibility,—the *subject-matter* of papal definitions. What is the subject-matter of the Pope's supreme and infallible teaching office? To this question we can answer in general with the Vatican Council,¹ that the subject-matter of the teaching office of the Pope, and therefore of his infallibility, is *coextensive with* the teaching office and the infallibility of the Church itself. "Ea infallibilitate pollet, qua divinus Redemptor ecclesiam suam in definienda doctrina de fide vel monibus instructam esse voluit." In other words, the infallibility of the Pope extends to all questions of *faith and morals*, that is, to all those things which, in the dispensation of God, we are to *believe* and to *do* in order to gain our last end.

To the doctrine of faith and morals belong, in the first instance, *all revealed truths*, the entire deposit of faith. That the Church, and, consequently, the Pope, is infallible in teaching, defining, proposing, and defending the deposit of faith is manifest from the promise of Christ to his Apostles and their successors: "Going, therefore, *teach* ye all nations . . . teaching them to observe *all things* whatsoever I have commanded you; and behold *I am with you* all days, even to the consummation of the world."² In these words the Saviour guarantees to His Apostles and their successors His never-failing assistance while *teaching all things*, which He commanded them to believe and to do, that is, the entire deposit of truth in regard to faith and morals. For this same end He promised and communicated to them the Holy Ghost, the spirit of truth, who was to abide with them forever and to teach them *all truth* and to bring *all things* to their mind whatsoever Christ Himself had taught them.³ Hence He sealed their teaching with the gift of miracles. "They, going forth, preached everywhere, the Lord working withal and confirming the word with signs that followed."⁴ He identifies their teaching with His own. "He that heareth you heareth Me; and he that despiseth you despiseth me."⁵ He pronounces the sentence of condemnation on those who refuse to believe their teaching: "He that believeth not shall be condemned,"⁶ which

¹ Const. de Eccl., c. 4.

³ John xiv., 16, 26.

⁵ Luke x., 16.

² Matt. xxviii., 19, 20.

⁴ Mark xvi., 20.

⁶ Mark xiv., 16.

would be an unwarrantable punishment in the supposition that the Apostles and their successors, the teaching Church, could err in the teaching of divine revelation. In fact, if the Church, and, consequently, the Pope, were not infallible in teaching, defining, expounding, and defending the deposit of revelation, its infallibility would be but an empty sound, without meaning or import, since this is the precise end for which the prerogative of infallibility was conferred by Christ on His Church.

But if the Church, and also the Pope, is infallible in the propagation and preservation of Christ's doctrine or of those truths that are directly revealed, it follows that it is also infallible in the definition of all those truths that are necessary for this end, though they may not be directly revealed. For if the Church has the right to the end, that is, to the effectual preservation and defence of the deposit of faith, it has also the right to the means necessary for this end. But in order efficaciously to preserve and defend the deposit of faith, it is necessary also as a means to defend those natural truths on which revelation is based; and if the Church is infallible in pursuing its chief end, *i.e.*, the custody of the deposit of faith, it must be infallible also in adopting the necessary means for this end. Hence we must say that the Church, and therefore also the Pope, is infallible in defining and defending those non-revealed truths that are in such wise connected with revealed truth that their denial would logically involve the denial of revelation itself wholly or in part, or at least endanger the faith. Such truths are chiefly *dogmatic facts*, and the true interpretation of *dogmatic texts* of human origin.

Dogmatic facts are certain truths or facts, which are necessarily presupposed as the foundation or condition without which certain dogmas could not exist. Such are, for instance, the authenticity of the Scriptures, the legitimacy of Œcumenical Councils, the validity of papal elections, the historic truth of the miracles of our Lord, and of the Gospel narratives generally, the veracity of the senses in perceiving external facts, the unity of the human species or the descent of our entire race from one man and one woman. Deny these facts or truths and the fundamental dogmas of religion come to nought. The divinity of Christ, the institution of the Church, the inspiration of the Scriptures, original sin, the doctrine of the redemption—in a word, the whole Christian religion falls to the ground with these few fundamental truths.

It is evident, therefore, that the Church could not efficaciously guard and defend the deposit of faith unless its infallible teaching office extended also to such dogmatic facts. Infallibility in the teaching, defining, and defending of dogmatic truth without infallibility in judging of the rational foundations on which they are

based would be simply illusory. Without this infallibility in judging of dogmatic facts the deposit of revelation would be a fabric without a foundation, a castle in the air. Hence we must conclude that the Church is infallible in defining all those truths that are necessarily supposed or required, for the understanding, exposition and defence of revealed truth. Truths thus defined by the Church, though not directly revealed, and therefore not of divine faith, are none the less certain than if they were contained in the deposit of faith itself. While revealed truths are firmly and unconditionally accepted on the authority of God (*fide divina*), such defined dogmatic facts are to be believed on the infallible authority of the Church (*fide ecclesiastica*). He who would deny such a dogmatic fact defined by the Church, though not technically a *heretic* would be under manifest *error* in a matter intimately bearing on divine faith, and guilty of grievous temerity and irreverence toward the Church.

Hence the Church has at all times not only condemned doctrines which were diametrically opposed to revealed truth and therefore *heretical*, but also such as were simply *erroneous*, without being heretical, as false, scandalous, ambiguous, misleading, offensive to pious sentiment, etc. Thus, for instance, the propositions of Huss and Wicklif were condemned as partly erroneous and partly scandalous and offensive to pious ears; and the Church exacted of their followers not only simply to renounce the articles of Huss and Wicklif, but also to *believe* the declaration of the Sacred Council of Constance that those articles *were* "partly notoriously *heretical*, partly *erroneous*, partly rash and seditious."

In like manner, Clement XI., in the Bull *Unigenitus*, solemnly condemns the errors of Quesnell, and enjoins upon all the faithful "not to presume to think, teach or preach on those propositions otherwise than laid down in said constitution." And in a subsequent constitution the same Pope declared all those who refuse to accept that constitution as outside the pale of the Church. Similar declarations are to be found in the Bull *Auctorem fidei* issued by Pius VI. against the doctrines of the Jansenist Synod of Pistoia and in the encyclical *Quanta cura* of Pius IX. We mention these documents with preference because they are all admitted by Catholic theologians to be *ex cathedra* pronouncements, and because they condemn not only heretical, but also *erroneous* doctrines.

From this it follows that the Pope can by infallible definition approve or condemn philosophical doctrines, inasmuch as they are necessarily required for, or opposed, to the true understanding of the truths of revelation. This belongs essentially to the infallible teaching office of the Church, and is consequently within the

scope of Papal infallibility. Therefore the Vatican Council¹ teaches as follows: "The Church, which together with the apostolic office of teaching, has also received the injunction to *guard* the deposit of faith, has the divinely imparted right and duty to *condemn false science*, lest any one should be deceived by philosophy and vain fallacy. Wherefore all faithful Christians are not only forbidden to defend as the legitimate conclusions of science, but are absolutely bound to hold as *errors* bearing the semblance of truth, such opinions as are known to be contrary to the teaching of faith, especially if they have been condemned by the Church."

Here there is manifestly question not merely of heretical opinions, directly opposed to revealed truth, but of error which, though not heretical, cannot be reconciled with divine revelation. But, lest there should remain any doubt on the matter, the council in the closing words of the same constitution adds: "Since it is not sufficient to shun heretical depravity, unless *those errors also are carefully avoided, which more or less nearly approach it*, we admonish all of the duty of observing the constitutions and decrees in which such *false opinions*, as are not here expressly enumerated, and have been proscribed and interdicted by the Holy See."

Such philosophic truths, therefore, as are not directly revealed, but are more or less closely connected with revelation must be considered as forming part of the object-matter of the Church's teaching office, not inasmuch as they are merely natural truths, but inasmuch as they are necessary for the custody, development, and defence of the deposit of faith. Hence the following propositions have been justly condemned in the *Syllabus* by Pius IX: 11. "The Church should not only abstain from correcting philosophy, but should also tolerate the errors of philosophy, and leave it to correct itself." 14. "Philosophy is to be treated without any regard to supernatural revelation."² And the Vatican Council³ declares: "If any one shall say that the human sciences are to be so freely treated that their assertions, though opposed to revealed truth, are to be held as true, and cannot be condemned by the Church; let him be anathema."

Nor does the Church thereby become a teacher of science or philosophy. It is concerned with the natural sciences only in as far as they bear upon revelation, and no further. A philosopher is free to teach the most absurd things, as far as the Church is concerned, provided only his errors are confined to the sphere of the merely natural sciences. In that case the Church allows philosophy to correct itself. But as soon as error encroaches on the field of revealed truth, the Church cannot remain indifferent. It

¹ Const. de fide, cap. 4.

² Cf. props. 10, 12.

³ Const. de fide, c. 4, can. 2.

must interpose its *non possumus* ; it must call a halt ; it must cry : " thus far, and no further ! "

Nor is this an inconvenience or a restraint on science. On the contrary, it is a great benefit to science and scientists ; for it is no slight benefit to the scientist to know from the very outset that the results of his researches, all the conclusions of his speculations, which are opposed to revealed truth are certainly false, and that careful consideration will show in the case of such discrepancy that he has erred in his investigation. In vain will he endeavor to establish his conclusions against divine truth. *Veritas domini manet in æternum.*

So long, however, as there is no peremptory decision of the Church in regard to a scientific point bearing on revealed truth or on the interpretation of the Scripture, the scientist is free to pursue his investigations and to establish a conclusion, which may seem to be at a variance with a received *opinion* of theologians or interpretation of the Scriptures, provided he do so with due deference to the teaching authority of the Church. If such a conclusion is once scientifically established beyond all doubt, Catholic theologians and interpreters, as in case of the Copernican system, will with the sanction of the Church modify their opinions. But so long as only hypotheses and conjectures are used in lieu of arguments it is vain and presumptuous on the part of scientists to dictate to the teaching Church. Such conduct on the part of scientists is blameworthy, to say the least ; and, although their theories may not deserve to be condemned, yet their arrogance deserves to be rebuked. It is only in the case of manifest opposition to revealed truth that the Church makes use of its supreme and infallible authority to condemn the false theories of philosophers ; and then the question is settled for every true Catholic, and should be settled also for every true philosopher and scientist. For what is contrary to revealed truth cannot be in accordance with the teaching of reason. Truth is one.

Another class of dogmatic facts, strictly and technically so called, in the definition of which the Church, and also the Pope, is infallible, is the true and objective interpretation of *texts of merely human origin*, when there is question of revealed truths or of theological truths that come under the Church's teaching authority. That the Church is infallible in the interpretation of the *inspired text* of the Scriptures goes without saying, since the latter form part of the deposit of revelation, committed to the Church's safe-keeping. The question here is, whether the Church, or the Pope, is infallible in defining the true, that is, the objective, sense of dogmatic texts written without the supernatural impulse and guidance of inspiration—whether, for instance, a certain teaching is objec-

tively contained in a certain book composed by human aid, or whether the words of a holy Father, or the decree of an Œcumenical council, express such or such a truth.

This question assumed a practical aspect in the *controversy with the Jansenists*. After the five propositions, extracted from the *Augustinus* of Jansenius, had been condemned by Innocent X. and Alexander VIII. the Jansenists adopted a new species of tactics. They distinguished between the question of *right* and that of *fact*. They agreed that the five propositions attributed to Jansenius, and condemned by the Church, were false and justly condemned (question of *right*). In this the Church could not err. But they denied that said propositions were contained in the book of Jansenius entitled *Augustinus* (question of *fact*). This being a merely human fact, they said, the Church might err in defining it. The case of one holding this view was submitted to the university of the Sorbonne and sustained by the vote of forty of its doctors; but their decision was condemned by Clement XI., February 13, 1703, in the constitution *Vincam Domini*, wherein the sovereign pontiff declared: "In order that all occasion of error may be cut off for the future, and all the children of the Catholic Church may learn to hear the Church itself, not merely in silence (for even the wicked in darkness are silent), but with internal submission, which is the obedience of the orthodox man . . . we decree and declare by this our constitution, which is to have perpetual force, that respectful silence is by no means sufficient to comply with that duty of obedience which is due to the aforesaid constitution, [viz., the constitutions of Innocent X. and Alexander VII. condemning the five propositions of Jansenius;] but that the *sense* of the book of Jansenius which is condemned in the five propositions aforesaid, *and which is expressed in their wording*, as it runs, is to be accepted and condemned by all the Christian faithful, not only with their lips, but also with their hearts."

And, in fact, the Church has always claimed and exercised the right of judging of the sense of propositions, books and documents of human origin. Thus the Fathers of the Council of Nice condemned not only the doctrine of Arius in general, but also his book, that bore the title of "Thalia," and the "execrable words and expressions he used to blaspheme the Son of God." So, also, Pelagius was called upon by Pope Innocent I. to renounce and condemn the doctrines contained in a book attributed to him as "blasphemous," and "to be condemned and spurned" by all good men.¹ In like manner the Council of Ephesus approved the letter of St. Cyril of Alexandria to Nestorius as orthodox, and con-

¹ Ep. ad quinque Epp.

demned that of Nestorius to St. Cyril as "manifestly at variance with, and foreign to, the faith of Nice." We have another instance in the condemnation of the famous Three Chapters, viz., the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia, certain writings of Theodore, and a letter of a certain bishop Ibas. The Council of Trent exercised the same power in declaring the authenticity of the Latin Vulgate version of the Scriptures, which was evidently a question of the conformity of a text of human origin with the original of the inspired books. In short, the Church constantly exercises this prerogative in all its doctrinal decrees, professions of faith, etc., for when it formulates a dogmatic declaration, or approves of a formula of faith, it implicitly asserts, with the same authority with which it defines or approves, that the doctrine defined or approved is actually contained in the form of words in which it is enunciated, and frequently pronounces the anathema on those who refuse to accept its doctrine as therein contained.

It is also the duty of the Church to preserve the correct form of words in which the dogmas of the faith are proposed to the faithful, according to the admonition of the Apostle to Timothy: "Hold the form of sound words which thou hast heard from me." Hence the Council of Trent² defends the propriety and the use of the word *transubstantiation* to express the mystery of the change of the substance of bread and wine into the body and blood of Jesus Christ in the Holy Eucharist. In fact, if the Church could err in the interpretation of the meaning of human speech as applied to subjects of faith and morals, its infallibility would be ineffectual, all its definitions and decrees would be illusory, its professions of faith would be vain, the forms of its sacraments would be doubtful, every one would be free to distort its teaching to whatever sense he pleased. Hence we must conclude that the Church, if infallible at all, must be infallible in the interpretation of dogmatic texts of human origin.

It must be borne in mind, however, that the Church does not judge of the *subjective* meaning of an author, but only of the *objective* sense of his words. If the author has thought rightly, but expressed himself erroneously, his conscience may justify him, but his meaning will be presumed to be that objectively conveyed by his words; for every one who writes or speaks publicly is supposed to use the words of the language in which he writes or speaks in their ordinary, obvious and natural meaning.

It might be objected that in order to be infallible in the interpretation of texts of human origin the Church and the Pope would have to know all languages. In the first place, I answer that for

¹ 2 Tim. i., 13.

² Sess. xii., c. 4, and can. 2.

the ordinary teaching office of the Church this difficulty does not exist. The Church, being Catholic, that is, diffused over the entire world, knows all languages and practically meets textual problems as they arise, in regard to the formulating of the articles of faith, the Christian doctrine, the form of the sacraments, the orthodoxy or heterodoxy of certain expressions, etc. If, in the second place, any question is deemed of such importance as to require the infallible judgment either of the entire teaching body, assembled or dispersed, or the Pope *ex cathedra*, sufficient evidence can be gained on the orthodoxy or heterodoxy of the text in question to secure moral certainty without obliging the Pope or the entire episcopate of the Catholic world to study the language in which the text at issue is expressed. In the doctrinal tribunal of the Church, as in other courts, human testimony has its use and application. There is this difference, however, that in the supreme tribunal of the Church the judge or judges, having the special assistance of the Holy Ghost, cannot err in their verdict or decision in matters of faith or morals.

So much on the doctrinal infallibility of the Church and of the Pope. Is the Pope, it may be further asked, infallible in framing and enacting *disciplinary* laws, decisions, decrees, etc.? There is of course, question here only of universal laws and decrees, binding the whole Church, in matters of discipline. Such are, for instance, laws regarding divine worship and the liturgy of the Church, fasts and feasts to be kept, the celebration of Christian marriage, the celibacy of the clergy, the obligation of hearing Mass, yearly confession and communion, etc. It is here not a question of doctrine but of practice, although the Church's practice is, to some extent, based upon her doctrine. The point at issue is whether the Church or the Pope can in disciplinary matters prescribe anything to the whole Church which is evil in itself, unjust or contrary to revelation. Put in this form the question must be answered *in the negative*; and in this sense we say that the Church and the Pope are infallible in disciplinary laws and decisions.

The reason is patent. The discipline of the Church, though not directly revealed in its details, is closely connected with revelation, inasmuch as it must be in accordance with the fundamental laws contained in revelation, and inasmuch as any error (*i.e.*, anything immoral or contrary to revelation) in the universal disciplinary laws of the Church would practically imply or lead to a doctrinal error. A universal law, for instance, absolutely refusing reconciliation to a certain class of sinners, though penitent, or imposing the obligation of actual poverty on all Christians, or forbidding the baptism of infants, would naturally suppose or lead to the doctrinal errors that the Church had not the power to forgive all sins;

that private property was unlawful, and that baptism was either not necessary for salvation, or that the baptism of infants was invalid.

Moreover, Christ promised His assistance to His Apostles and their successors, not only in their teaching ministry, but also in the government of the Church; not only while teaching the faithful to *believe* all things, but also while teaching them to "*observe* all things" which He commanded them.¹ And therefore, "he that will not hear the Church [in matters of discipline as well as in matters of faith], let him be to thee as a heathen and a publican."² And "he that heareth you heareth me; and he that despiseth you despiseth me."³ And again: "Whatsoever you shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven."⁴ From all these texts, it follows that the Church's supreme authority, whether vested in all the bishops together or in the Pope alone, cannot enjoin anything on the whole Church in matters of discipline which is contrary to the law of God, whether expressed positively in His commandments, or merely by the natural law. Else God would contradict Himself by ratifying in advance what would be contrary to His own law.

We do not, of course, maintain that the Church or the Pope cannot err in particular precepts regarding individuals, classes, or communities. Neither do we deny that individual bishops, or the Pope, when he does not act as the supreme pastor of all the faithful, and in virtue of his supreme power, may err. We speak only of the universal teaching and ruling body of the Church, or the Pope when speaking *ex cathedra*. Neither do we defend that the universal teaching and ruling Church, or the Pope *ex cathedra*, will always enact what is absolutely the best for the Church, for God Himself, the Supreme Ruler and Lawgiver of the universe, though He has done all things well and disposes all things wisely, neither Himself ordains, nor requires of His creatures what is absolutely the best.

The question arises whether the Church—that is, the Pope—is infallible in the *canonization of the Saints*, viz., whether it is infallibly true that those who are solemnly declared saints, and whose veneration is prescribed for the whole Church, are really in the enjoyment of eternal glory. There is question of the canonization, strictly so-called, not of the beatification, of the servants of God, nor of the toleration of the local *cultus* of certain persons who departed this life in the reputation of exalted sanctity, but of their solemn proposition by the Pope for universal veneration. Thus formulated, the query is generally answered by theologians in the *affirmative*; and the contrary opinion may be said to be obsolete

¹ Matt. xxviii., 20.

² Matt. xviii., 17.

³ Luke x., 16.

⁴ Matt. xvi., 19; cf. xviii., 18.

in truly Catholic schools. Pope Benedict XIV.¹ says that to deny the infallibility of the Pope in the canonization of the servants of God would be, "if not heretical, at least rash, and an occasion of scandal to the entire Church."

The reason is obvious. In the canonization of the saints the Pope declares a truth to be believed by the whole Church; namely, that such servants of God are actually in the enjoyment of everlasting glory. But the Pope cannot err in such a declaration, because he cannot impose a truth to be believed upon the whole Church on other grounds than his infallible authority; else he might invincibly lead the faithful into error. That the Pope, in the canonization of the saints, wishes to use his supreme authority and to impose the obligation of assent on the faithful is manifest from the form of words used in the bulls of canonization, and certainly it would be rash, to say the least, to assert that the Church, or the Pope, could be deceived or could mislead the faithful in a matter of such vital importance for the glory of God and the salvation of men. If the possibility of error were admitted in this case, there would be absolutely no guarantee for the purity of the Church's worship; the Church or the Pope could prescribe a false form of worship, which is contrary to the universal belief of the Church.

It is manifest that the infallibility of the Church in the canonization of the saints is not confined to those cases in which the strict canonical process prescribed by modern usage has been instituted. It extends also to those that have been universally venerated as saints in the Church before this process was introduced. For the universal Church, in its uniform teaching and practice, has the same prerogative of infallibility as the Pope or a General Council. If, therefore, a saint is found to have been venerated in the whole Church unanimously, before the end of the tenth century, when the present procedure of canonization was introduced, such must be regarded as saints no less than those canonized by this special process.

Theologians, in discussing the extent of papal infallibility, are also wont to put the question whether or not the Pope is infallible in the *approbation of religious orders*? All agree that the Pope could not, in virtue of his infallibility, solemnly approve for the whole Church, a religious institute, which, *in itself*, would be a hindrance instead of a help towards Christian perfection. But in regard to the practical question of prudence, whether the Pope or the Church could approve an order which, under the concrete circumstances of its approval, would prove injurious to the Church, there is a

¹ *De Canoniz. Sanct.*, l. i., cap. 45.

diversity of opinion among theologians. Here, we suppose, there is not question of mere toleration, nor of partial or limited approbation for a certain province or district, but that the approval is unconditional and universal in the customary form. These conditions being verified, we say that the Pope cannot *practically* err in the approbation of a religious order.

For, according to the customary form, the Pope in such cases acts as the teacher, pastor and ruler of the universal Church, uses his supreme apostolic authority, and not only approves the constitutions of such religious orders as a safe guide to Christian perfection for those who choose to follow such institutes, but he also imposes on all the faithful the obligation to regard such institutes as holy, useful and salutary, not only in themselves, but also under the concrete circumstances in which they exist. Hence it is that he not unfrequently in the constitutions approving religious orders defends their institutes against hostile attacks by the severest penalties. Under such circumstances it seems rash and derogatory to the authority and infallibility of the Pope to suppose that he could be deceived himself and deceive the faithful in a matter so grave.

The case is very different if there is question of the suppression of an existing religious order. For the suppression affects the members alone and imposes no obligation on the Church at large. But the doctrinal and disciplinary infallibility is guaranteed to the Pope and to the teaching and ruling Church only in things affecting the whole Church.

I consider it needless to add that the Church, and consequently the Pope, is infallible in *defining the extent of its own rights*, e.g., the right to civil immunity and the right of the political independence of the Holy See. For these rights are either defined by revelation itself or are corollaries, which naturally follow from the constitution of the Church, as outlined in Revelation. The opposite doctrine is condemned in the encyclical *Quanta cura* by Pius IX. "We cannot pass in silence," says the Sovereign Pontiff, "the audacity of those who, impatient of sound doctrine, maintain that assent can be denied those decisions and decrees of the Holy See, which regard *the general good of the Church and its rights* . . . without sin and *without any loss of their standing as Catholics*."

From the very fact, then, the Church, and also the Pope, is infallible in teaching, defining, proposing and defending the deposit of revelation, or in all those things that belong to faith and morals, it follows that it is also infallible in defining those truths and facts which are necessary for this end; and since it is infallible in the government and direction of the faithful to the end proposed to them by the Redeemer, that it must be infallible also in determin-

ing the chief means necessary for this end, that is, in disciplinary measures regarding the observance of the moral law, the divine worship, and the practice of Christian and religious perfection. Hence we concluded that the infallibility of the Church, and consequently of the Pope, extends not only to revealed truths but also to dogmatic facts, to disciplinary laws and decisions, to the canonization of the saints, and to the approbation of religious orders, and to the defence of its own rights, under the conditions and with the restrictions which we have been careful to make in the progress of this paper.

But neither the Church nor the Pope claims infallibility in the teaching of *merely natural truths* and sciences. They leave the scientist perfect freedom within his own sphere, and aid him by their council and direction. Therefore, the Vatican Council¹ declares: "The Church, far from being a hindrance to the cultivation of the human arts and sciences, aids and promotes it in many ways. For it does not ignore nor disregard the benefit accruing to human life from the human sciences; nay, it acknowledges, that as these proceed from God, the Lord of sciences, so, if properly treated, they lead to God with the assistance of His grace. Nor does the Church prevent such sciences, each in its sphere, to follow their own principles and their own method. But while it acknowledges this due freedom, it is solicitous that the sciences do not espouse errors which are repugnant to divine truth, or transgress their proper limits, and encroach upon and endanger the domain of faith."

IV.

It remains to consider the *form* under which decisions *ex cathedra* must be couched, in order that they may be regarded as final. And, first of all, it must be remarked that the Pope is not confined to any form in particular. When we call a definition *ex cathedra*, we do not imply a decision which has been given with certain formalities, but a decree or definition in which the Pope, acting as the teacher of the whole Church, imposes an obligation on all the faithful to hold a certain truth. This he may do in various ways. He has been commissioned by Christ to feed the whole flock; that is, to teach, to rule, and to govern it. But Christ has prescribed no special form to him when he wishes to act in the capacity of supreme and universal teacher and ruler. The Saviour only commissioned him to feed the flock, to strengthen his brethren. He did not specify the means His vicegerent was to employ in so doing. The only restriction is, that he cannot delegate his supreme and infallible teaching authority to another,

¹ Const. de fide, c. 4.

since this prerogative is inseparably joined to the primacy, and can be exercised by no one who is not actually the successor of St. Peter. He may teach by writing or by word of mouth. He may address himself to one or to many. He may embody his teaching in the solemn form of a bull, of an allocution, or of letters apostolic; he may use the less solemn form of brief, encyclical, or epistle to an individual; or he may by special approval make his own the decrees of a provincial synod, or the decision of one of the Roman congregations.

One thing, however, is required in all cases in the form of an *ex cathedra* definition: it must be couched in such terms as sufficiently to express all the conditions necessary for such a pronouncement. It must be apparent from the tenor of the document that the Pope speaks as the pastor of all the faithful in the entire Christian world, in virtue of his supreme pastoral authority, with the intention of imposing an obligation of unconditional and irrevocable assent. In addition to this, of course, it must be supposed that the subject-matter lies within the range of those objects which fall under the Church's and the Pope's teaching office; that is, it must be a revealed truth or a truth in some way necessarily connected with revelation. Yet, it must be borne in mind that the competent judge in this matter is the Church itself or the Pope, not the faithful to whom the truth is proposed; and in this judgment the Church cannot err, being the infallible custodian and dispenser of the deposit of faith. If, then, the other conditions are fulfilled, it will necessarily follow that the subject-matter of the definition is within the competence of the Church's or the Pope's teaching authority.

If these conditions are not sufficiently expressed or implied in the document itself or in its adjuncts, the presumption is that the utterance is not *ex cathedra*, but that the Pope, though he may act in the capacity of supreme pastor of all the faithful, and address himself to the whole Church, does not intend to give a final decision and impose an absolute obligation on the entire Church in virtue of such document. Such, we may suppose, are many papal declarations (encyclicals, letters apostolic, allocutions, etc.). They are authentic statements of doctrine or condemnation of errors, which have the highest human authority, claiming of themselves *religious* and *internal*, but not necessarily in all cases a *solute*, assent. Yet, in many cases, as I have said, such decisions impose absolute assent either as testifying Catholic faith, or from the subsequent consent of the entire teaching Church; and thus in either case the truth set forth in them may be absolutely binding on the whole Church, as embodying the universal belief of the judges of the faith dispersed throughout the world.

The conditions of an *ex cathedra* utterance, it seems to me, are nowhere more clearly expressed than in the Bull *Ineffabilis*, Dec. 10, 1854, defining the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary. "In honor of the Holy and undivided Trinity, for the praise and glory of the Virgin Mother of God, for the exaltation of the Catholic faith, and the increase of the Christian religion, *by the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of the blessed Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, and our own; we declare, pronounce and define* the doctrine which holds that the most Blessed Virgin Mary was in the first moment of her conception, by a singular grace and privilege, in view of the merits of Jesus Christ, the Saviour of mankind, preserved from every stain of original sin, *has been revealed by God, and is therefore to be firmly and constantly believed by all the faithful.* Therefore, if any person should presume to think in their heart otherwise than defined by us, let them know and be henceforth convinced that, being condemned by their own judgment, they have suffered shipwreck in the faith, and have fallen away from the unity of the faith, and besides have by that very fact made themselves amenable to the penalties fixed by law, if, by word of mouth or in writing, or by other external means, they shall presume to give utterance to the sentiment of their heart."

Every condition is most prominently brought out in this definition, the Pope evidently acts as the father and teacher of all the faithful, "for the exaltation of the Catholic faith," etc. He uses his supreme apostolic authority, "the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ," etc. He imposes a strict obligation of assent upon the whole Church, proposing the dogma as a revealed truth "to be firmly and constantly believed by all the faithful."

The same conditions are clearly manifest in the famous encyclical of Pius IX., beginning with the words *Quanta cura*, Dec. 8, 1864, condemning certain errors of modern times. The Pope here also appeals to his "apostolic office," raises his "apostolic voice," and in virtue of his "*apostolic authority, rejects, proscribes and condemns* all and each of the false opinions and doctrines mentioned in these apostolic letters, and *absolutely wills and commands* that they be considered as proscribed and condemned."

If we compare these documents with some other doctrinal declarations of Pius IX., and of Leo XIII., we find a marked difference. While the encyclicals, allocutions and letters of these two pontiffs generally propose Catholic doctrine and condemn errors regarding faith and morals in the clearest and most unmistakable terms, and while they are doubtless meant to be a practical and authentic rule of Catholic teaching for the bishops, the schools, and the faithful at large, yet the intention of the Pope to interpose his supreme authority, and absolutely to bind the whole Church

precisely in virtue of these declarations is not sufficiently apparent in most of them, to stamp them as undoubted *ex cathedra* pronouncements. Yet, as I have already remarked, these documents, in many instances, are the expression of Catholic teaching; and in all cases they are practically authoritative declarations which bind in conscience not only to respectful silence, but to internal and religious assent; and most of them have been so universally and religiously received, and so assiduously inculcated by the Bishops of the whole Church, that they may now be regarded as the expressions of Catholic doctrine which no one could reject without incurring the gravest censure short of heresy. In this light, *ad minimum*, we must view the famous *syllabus* of Pius IX., and most, if not all, of the encyclicals of our gloriously reigning Pope Leo XIII.

But why leave us in suspense regarding the doctrinal value of such papal documents? Why, it has been asked, does not the Pope simply tell us in each document whether it is *ex cathedra* or not? Or, if a truth is definable, that is, revealed or necessarily connected with revealed doctrine, why not define it and have done with it? To this I answer, first of all, that we have not to dictate to the Holy Ghost in regard to the development and definition of the deposit of faith. Nor can the Pope, though infallible at all times, and always ready to meet doubts and controversies as they come up, impose upon himself or on his successors any definite line of action in this matter. "The Spirit breatheth where He will."¹ According to the direction of the Spirit of Truth, who always guides and assists him, the Pope uses his supreme authority only in extraordinary cases, when the ordinary teaching office as exercised by himself and the bishops, his associate judges, is not sufficient to bring the human intellect into subjection unto the obedience of faith. The supreme head of the Church exercises not only the functions of a ruler and judge in matters of faith and morals, but he also acts the part of a good father, who does not in all cases make use of the fulness of his paternal authority. When a hint or a warning is sufficient, he does not impose a precept, and when a simple precept suffices he does not have recourse to the fulness of his power, but mindful of the words of the apostle, he preaches the word in season and out of season; he reproves, entreats, rebukes in all patience and doctrine, before using his supreme authority and pronouncing the final anathema. Besides, although the Holy Ghost was given to the Church to "teach it all truth" and to "bring all things to its mind," there is no promise to the effect that the Holy Ghost would bring all truths at once and at the same time to the

¹ John, iii., 8.

consciousness of the Church or of the Pope, but as often as it will appear necessary to give a final solution to a doubt or controversy, the Holy Ghost will not be wanting to the Church and to the Pope, but will bring them to the knowledge of the truth and direct and assist them to propose it in the way that is most to the glory of God, the good of the Church, and the salvation of immortal souls.

One remark remains still to be made in regard to the form of decisions *ex cathedra*. Not all that is contained in an *ex cathedra* document is by that very fact *ex cathedra* teaching, and therefore infallible. The infallibility is conferred exclusively, the doctrine defined *ex professo*, and does not extend to preambles, arguments, *obiter dicta*, etc., which may be embodied in the defining document. The doctrine stated in these non-essential parts of an *ex cathedra* pronouncement, therefore, though they may have great theological weight, have no claim to infallibility. Let us take an example. In the Bull *Ineffabilis*, above referred to, the definition, which we quoted in full, is preceded by a long, learned, and accurate theological statement of the tradition of the Church on the Immaculate Conception, all of which goes to show the definableness of the dogma, but forms no part of the definition itself, and has therefore a merely theological, but no dogmatic value. Suppose that any error or inaccuracy could be found in that statement, this would, by no means, affect the definition itself. Again, if we consider the dogmatic encyclical *Quanta cura*, before mentioned, we find that a large portion of it is strictly defining and therefore *ex cathedra*, inasmuch as the Pope first reviews at length the various errors condemned and then pronounces upon them from the fulness of his authority. Now, the Pope acts infallibly not only in pronouncing sentence upon these errors, but also in formulating them, else their condemnation would be ineffectual. The infallibility must therefore extend to that large portion of the document in which the errors are summed up, though it does not extend to the preamble and to the intervening remarks.

From the preceding it will be evident to the reader that while the Pope's infallibility in its extent coincides with the infallibility of the Church itself, and while the range of subjects on which the Pope is infallible is co-extensive with the deposit of revelation and all those non-revealed truths which are necessarily connected with revelation; yet, according to the custom of the Church, directed as it is by the Holy Ghost, the Pope rarely makes use of this prerogative, except on extraordinary occasions. Ordinarily the Pope, though he may act as the pastor and teacher of all the faithful, does not intend to use his supreme apostolic authority and to impose an obligation of absolute assent upon the whole Church.

He only discharges the function of the ordinary and practical, albeit authentic and universal, pastor and teacher of the entire flock. And in this capacity also the faithful are in conscience bound to give their religious and internal assent to his teaching. He who refuses to do so is a refractory member of the flock, inasmuch as he refuses to hear the voice of the shepherd; he jeopardizes his profession as a Catholic, and places himself practically outside the fold, inasmuch as he refuses to follow the shepherd, and feeds on dangerous and forbidden pasture of his own choosing.

To such have been directed the words of Pius IX. in his letter to the Archbishop of Munich, December 21, 1863. "It is not enough," says the Sovereign pontiff, "that Catholic scholars should receive and venerate the dogmas of the Church, but it is necessary also that they submit to the doctrinal decisions of the Pontifical Congregations [how much more to the doctrinal decisions of the Pope himself?], and to those parts of doctrine which are held by the common and constant consent of Catholics as theological truths and conclusions of such certainty, that opinions opposed to them, though they may not be called heretical, yet deserve some other theological censure."

This is the infallible criterion of a true Catholic spirit, reverently and religiously to submit to the decisions of the Holy See whether they are *ex cathedra*, irrevocable and infallible, or simple declarations of the Pope, or of the organs through which he acts in his ordinary capacity of common pastor and teacher of the flock of Jesus Christ. Truly has it been put down by St. Ignatius of Loyola as one of the rules of orthodox thinking: "*Laudare omnia præcepta Ecclesiæ, animum gerendo promptum ad quærendas rationes in eorum defensionem, et nullo modo in eorum impugnacionem.*"¹

JAMES CONWAY, S. J.

¹ Ex spirit, Reg. ad sent. cum Eccl. 9.

INDIAN BIBLIOGRAPHIES.

“SIC VOS NON VOBIS.”

Bibliography of the Eskimo Language. By James Constantine Pilling. Smithsonian Institution. Bureau of Ethnology. Washington. 1887. Quarto, S. E., pp. 116.

Bibliography of the Siouan Languages. By James Constantine Pilling. Smithsonian Institution. Bureau of Ethnology. Washington. 1887. Quarto, pp. 87.

Bibliography of the Iroquoian Languages. By James Constantine Pilling. Smithsonian Institution. Washington. 1888. Quarto, S. E., No. 82; pp. 208.

Bibliography of the Muskogean Languages. By James Constantine Pilling. Smithsonian Institution. Washington. 1889. Quarto, S. E., pp. 114.

Bibliography of the Algonquian Languages. By James Constantine Pilling. Smithsonian Institution. Bureau of Ethnology. Washington. 1891. Quarto, S. E., No. 67; pp. 614.

Bibliography of the Athapascan Languages. By James Constantine Pilling. Smithsonian Institution. Bureau of Ethnology. Washington. 1892. Quarto, S. E., No. 72; pp. 125.

Bibliography of the Chinookan Languages (including the Chinook jargon). By James Constantine Pilling. Smithsonian Institution. Bureau of Ethnology. Washington. 1893. Quarto, S. E., pp. 81.

“THE best blood of England flows in my veins. On my father’s side I am a Northumberland, on my mother’s I am related to kings; but it avails me not!

“My name shall live in the memory of man when the titles of the Northumberlands and the Percys are extinct and forgotten.”

These bitter words, and this emphatic prophecy, were written in the third decade of the present century by the founder of the Smithsonian Institution of Washington.

Louis Macie was the illegitimate son of Hugh Smithson, Duke of Northumberland, by Elizabeth Macie, the rich heiress of the Hungerfords of Studley, and niece of Charles, Duke of Somerset. He was born in 1756.

Louis changed his name, in deference to his mother, to James Smithson, when he entered upon his studies at Oxford.

The grand old Norman and Catholic race of the Percys, earls of Northumberland, has become extinct in the direct line; the name and titles were assumed, by parliamentary authority, by Sir

Hugh Smithson, Baronet, in the 17th century, whose family had been enobled by Charles II. in reward for services rendered the Stuart cause.

The Smithsons were of good old Catholic stock, and the last earl of the Percys and Northumberlands of the old faith was Hugh Smithson. He abjured the religion of his honored forefathers and died in 1729 an adherent of the Established Church, despite the prayers of his sisters, Bridget, Catharine, Dorothy and Mary Smithson, Carmelite nuns, who died in the odor of sanctity in the same convent in Flanders.¹

The earldom of Percy and Northumberland was raised to a dukedom in the English peerage, in 1776, and the descendants of Sir Hugh Smithson have since reigned over its great estates as Dukes of Northumberland.

The career of James Smithson at Oxford was a brilliant one; he graduated with the highest honors attainable.

He was reserved and studious, but he became celebrated as a scientist in the highest literary circles of London and a member of the Royal Society.

However, the stain upon his birth was ever present to his mind, and he became morbidly sensitive, perhaps unnecessarily so, to this reproach, while mingling with the accomplished and brilliant men of that period of literary life in London.

That he was the son of a duke, that he was rich, he considered, made the circumstance of his illegitimate birth all the more apparent! Of what avail was the literary renown he had won, his ducal lineage and his wealth, when he felt certain that he was indelibly marked with the stain of sin, although his private life was singularly exemplary and in contrast to that of his distinguished associates!

Brooding over such miseries, whether imaginary or real, he left London to reside in Paris; in this great centre of the arts and sciences, and among a people permeated with the consequences of the licentious periods of the Revolution and the Empire, he could live without the fear of reproach, until, perhaps, reminded of his misfortune, whenever he chanced to meet his fellow-countrymen.

His ability won him renown and literary honors in Paris; he achieved what perhaps no countryman of his had ever before achieved, he was elected vice-president of the Institute of France, an honor rarely conferred upon a foreigner, and still more rarely upon an Englishman.

Were the imperishable records of his genius insufficient to establish his claim to celebrity, this high position he had won in

¹ Sir J. Bernard Burk, *English Peerage*.

competition with the French savants of that period, seals his record and renown.

All honor to the memory of James Smithson!

He never married, and died in Genoa in 1829 in the 73d year of his age. He left the large fortune which came from his unfortunate mother to a bachelor nephew on the maternal side, Henry James Hungerford, providing in his will that the latter might enjoy this wealth while he lived, and at his death, the residue was to revert to the government of the United States for the purpose of founding an institution at Washington to be called the Smithsonian Institution, "for the increase and diffusion of knowledge among men."

Henry James Hungerford died in 1835, and the American government recovered through the Court of Chancery in London, in 1838, upwards of half a million of dollars, which sum was available for carrying out the intention of James Smithson, its generous donor.

But it required eight years of congressional deliberation and delay before the intended benefaction was given shape.

May 1, 1847, nearly half a century ago, the corner-stone of the Smithsonian Institution of Washington was laid.

In time the building was in part completed and opened under the management of Joseph Henry.

It is one of the few institutions in the capital of this country which has remained unpolluted by political control; it has become the centre of scientific work, and in conformity with the intention of its founder, disseminates, by its publications, "knowledge among men." Not far from the "Smithsonian," another institution of learning has been recently reared under the auspices of the Catholic hierarchy of the United States. The Catholic University has been substantially founded by the liberality of those professing the same faith, as did the progenitors of James Smithson, and both will honor the historic name of Washington.

The signs of the times we are living in, if we can judge by public sentiment in England, would seem to indicate that the system of British nobility which has so long prevailed, has lost much of its prestige; the question of the abolition of the political power of the British House of Lords, has been openly discussed. It would not be surprising to see such power withdrawn, even during the period of the present generation; should such an event occur, the titles, immunities and prestige of the nobility, would probably be abolished; the law of primogeniture and entail also, and a division of wealth among the *ci-devant* privileged classes ensue.

When these events shall have occurred, the prophecy of James Smithson may be fulfilled.

Among the respective schools of study in the "Smithsonian," is the Bureau of Ethnology, under the direction of Major James W. Powell.

In this bureau James Constantine Pilling, has probably accomplished one of the greatest achievements in the history of American literature.

He has compiled and edited "The Bibliography of the American Indian Races."

James Constantine Pilling was born of Roman Catholic parents, in the city of Washington, D. C., November 16th, 1846.

From the age of 10 to 13 he attended school at the Washington Seminary, since known as Gonzaga College. At 13 he attended the public schools and at 16 had gone through all the grades then existing.

Preferring to be self-supporting he refused his father's offer of a college course and sought employment in a book store. He remained in business life about five years, having in the meantime acquired a knowledge of stenography, which profession he adopted at 21, and in which he remained for six years, being engaged for the greater part of the time in work for the United States Government, with the Congressional committees, the various claims commissions, the courts, etc., when impaired eyesight caused a temporary cessation of stenographic work.

During the time he had made a special study of phonetics and became expert in the rendering of dialect speech.

In the early part of 1873 Major J. W. Powell, the chief of the United States Geological and Topographical Surveys, who had become much interested during his Western work in the study of Indian languages, invited Mr. Pilling to join his corps with a view to utilizing his services in the proper recording of this material, and since that time Mr. Pilling has been continuously connected with this branch of work.

During these years he has come into contact with the Indian peoples of Idaho, Wyoming, Utah, Colorado, Nevada, California, and those on the reservations of New York State and southern Canada.

In 1878 he began the compilation of a catalogue of authors who had written on Indian languages with a list of their manuscripts and publications, and in the course of his work visited many of the principal libraries of this country, Canada and northern Mexico.

The results of these labors were published in 1885 in a large quarto of nearly 1200 pages, entitled "Proof Sheets of a Bibliography of the Indian Languages of North America."

In July, 1879, the then existing government surveys were abol-

ished, and in their stead the present United States Geological Survey was started.

At the same time there was organized the Bureau of Ethnology of the Smithsonian Institution, and Major Powell was selected as its director, and to this organization Mr. Pilling was transferred, continuing his linguistic studies and bibliographical work. In 1881 Major Powell was appointed director of the Geological Survey and Mr. Pilling its chief clerk, both retaining, however, their connection with the Bureau of Ethnology.

The administrative work of this position was so great that but little time could be spared for ethnologic work, and hence nights and Sundays were utilized.

Ill health, brought on by overwork, as in the case of his distinguished contemporary, Doctor John Gilmary Shea, rendered a respite necessary.

Mr. Pilling fortunately took a "vacation," while Dr. Shea hastened his demise by more assiduous application to the crowning work of his life.

The summer of 1886 was spent by Mr. Pilling in Europe, when the large public and private libraries of England, France and the European capitals were visited, resulting in a great increase of bibliographical material to that contained in the "Proof Sheets."

Upon his return from Europe it was determined, upon consultation with the director, to publish this accumulated material in special bibliographies—each devoted to one linguistic family. The first, issued in 1887, was devoted to the Eskimo; and since then have appeared the publications above noted.

Exposure in the Western country, we are sorry to say, and overwork in the duties connected with the two bureaus have so impaired the health of Mr. Pilling that since 1889 he has been a partial cripple.

This caused his resignation from the Geological Survey, and since that time he has devoted his energies entirely to the Bureau of Ethnology.

Mr. Pilling is a member of the Anthropological Society of Washington, Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and the recipient of a medal from the Spanish Government for publications exhibited at the Columbian Celebration at Madrid, in 1892.

From the commencement of his researches he won the sympathetic co-operation of the bibliophiles and scholarly men, who had made collections of Americana, and he was given free access to private libraries and to the archives of American colleges and institutions.

Probably no institution of learning, no family archives, no

church, convent, or religious institution, existing on North American soil possessing prints or manuscripts relating to the Indian races, that came to his knowledge has escaped his research.

We have learned to regard these bibliographies, and more especially the Algonquian, the Iroquoian and the Siouan, as among the most valuable books of reference, in an American historical point of view, which have ever appeared; we know they are destined to become necessities upon the tables of American historical students, as much so as are the standard dictionaries of modern languages.

This, perhaps, is claiming a great deal. But we freely assert that there is much to be found in the pages of these works calculated to bring a blush upon the self-satisfied expressions of some who are wearing contemporary honors as the authors of American histories.

When hereafter the learned student may turn his attention to the study of American aboriginal history, and as he honestly seeks to explore its groundwork, that he may write impartially, he will find in Pilling such valuable indices as will prompt him to accord his memory the highest praise. In what respect are these indices so valuable?

Because they constitute a hand-book, the like of which was never before compiled in which may be found the names of all the American tribes; the names of nearly all the missionaries who sought to convert the Indian races to Christianity; the description of all books known to exist, either in the native dialects or otherwise, relating to the Indians; where published, and at what time, and where they may be found; a description of all known manuscripts in existence in the world relating to the Indian races of North America; their authors, their contents, their dates, and their custodians. These are arranged in reference to each respective bibliography, alphabetically, with chronologically arranged indexes, such as will give the languages, titles, authors, localities and dates in this order.

While the eminent compiler has, as stated, been worn by the continuous strain upon his faculties in the preparation of these great works, no recognition of his merit, so far as we have heard, has come from the American universities, either by medal or degree.

It is not creditable to the reputation of our American institutions that such is the fact, and it probably could only happen that such neglect should be found in America. Had this man done as much for history in republican France, or in other European countries, he would have been loaded with medals and covered with honorary university and institutional degrees.

The many names of authors who have attempted to solve the problem of the origin of the aboriginal races of this country, given by Mr. Pilling and written in nearly all modern languages, confirms what General Cass wrote in 1829 of the futility of such attempts.

"Much labor and research," writes the general, "have been devoted to an inquiry into the origin and migration of the American Indian. Many idle notions have prevailed respecting these topics, unworthy now of serious examination except as they furnish evidence of the waywardness of the human intellect. That they are branches of the great Tartar stock is generally believed at the present day. Many points of resemblance, both physical and moral, leave little doubt upon the subject. But why, or when, or where the separation occurred, or by what route, or in what manner they were conducted from the plains of Asia to those of America it were vain to inquire and impossible to tell."¹

From the advent of the European on the soil of North America dates the decline of the aboriginal races. Victims of fate and of circumstances, their history may well excite our sympathy.

Probably few men who have written upon our Indian history were gifted with a more profound knowledge of the subject or could write with a more sympathetic pen, than Henry Rowe Schoolcraft, whose accomplished and beautiful wife was the child of an Irish father and the granddaughter of a Chippewa chief.

"Our entire Indian population," wrote Mr. Schoolcraft in 1833, "appears fated to decline; not so much, perhaps, from the want of external sympathy as from their falling under the operation of a general principle, which spares neither the white nor the red man, but inevitably dooms all who will not labor to suffering and want. Accustomed to live on game, they cannot resolutely make up their minds to become agriculturists, or shepherds, or mechanics."

They have outlived the true hunter state of the country, yet adhere with a fatal pertinacity to the maxims of a wandering life.

They pursue their intestine feuds with as determined a rancor as if they still had ample stores of animal food and unbounded ranges of territory to flee to.

They cannot be persuaded that there is any better mode of living than that pursued by their forefathers, or any state of freedom superior to that of savage independence. This is the whole mystery of their decline, however other secondary causes may have hastened and may still continue to accelerate it.

They have been taught from early life that to till the soil is dis-

¹ *Historical Sketches of Michigan*, p. 110.

honorable. That happiness consists in sensual enjoyments. That forecast is the distrust of Providence, the acquisition of property degrading, and generosity the test of greatness.

But their generosity often degenerates into extravagance, and their trust in Providence into an excuse for indolence. Their aversion to labor is often to be traced to the fear of ridicule. Their contempt for wealth, to the rage for popularity. The desire for personal distinction is frequently indulged at the expense of private rights, and of national wealth. Bravery is often another term for assassination, and riot a milder word for homicide.

No one can be insensible to the heroic traits of the Indian character. To his open hospitality—his constancy in professed friendships—his filial piety—his resignation under suffering, his valor in battle, and his triumph at the stake.

No nation, perhaps, ever felt a stronger love of country, or cherished a deeper veneration for their dead; and they linger round the places of their sepulture as if conscious that the period of separation was limited, and the soul itself immortal.

There is a charm cast over the hunter's life, which is easier to appreciate than describe. There is something noble in the situation and circumstances of the Indian, who confident in his own skill, is buoyed up in his frail canoe, or trusting to his own prowess, plunges into the deepest forest, reckless alike of danger and want—roving at will, without the ties of property to embarrass, or the obligation of laws to restrain him.

But it is the charm of poetry, and not of real life; it is sweet to the contemplation, but unreal. The pleasure arises from associations, which few will stop to analyse, but which every heart can feel; it is a pleasure which will remain, and be cherished as a species of intellectual talisman, long after the people, who are the sources of it, shall have submitted to their probable fate.

To save them from that fate is an object of high and disinterested attainment—difficult to be accomplished, if we may judge from the results of all experience.

But it is a work in which we cannot err on the side of clemency and magnanimity; in which treasure may be lost, but reputation must be acquired.

Our character as a social and intellectual people has often been judged, and we may say prejudged, by our treatment of the Indians. Their condition has been referred to in terms coupled with serious charges of delinquency in the great duties which a civilized owes to an uncivilized people. Remiss we may have been in some things, and in others fallen short of the zealous expectations of philanthropy and religion.

It was difficult, in every exigency, to reconcile the duties of self-preservation with simultaneous efforts of improvement.

But the difficulties were no sooner removed, than the efforts were renewed, and there is no period in our history as an independent nation, in which their welfare and preservation has not entered largely into our internal policy.

But in order to show how inadequate either the giving or withholding of extraneous aid has been to prevent some of the principal evils of their present condition, it is only necessary to advert to a few general facts :

In adjusting the ratio of population to the means of subsistence, it has been estimated that eight acres of land will support an agriculturalist ; but it may be doubted whether the range of 8000 acres will support a hunter.

Assuming this quantity, however, to be adequate, it would require a territory equal in extent to the State of Illinois to subsist a tribe of 5000 souls."¹

Mr. Schoolcraft wrote as a friend and in sympathy with the misfortunes of the Indian races.

It is not difficult to realize from his words, that their existence on American soil, side by side with a rapidly increasing population which continues to add new States to the federal Union, is an impossibility.

But he concludes his remarks upon their situation at the time, and this it should be remembered was sixty years ago, by ascribing other causes rather than their proximity to the whites for their constant decline in numbers while living in their natural or savage state, whether on reservations or on their own domain.

"Their general declension," he remarks, "may be sought in causes more constant in their operation, or more widely spread and destructive in their effects.

"Disease has swept away more than the sword or the battle. Internal dissensions ; scanty and unwholesome food ; the effects of alternate abstinence and repletion ; violent transitions from heat to cold—from intense and sudden exertion, to listless indolence ;² contempt of regimen ; a reliance on mystical medicines and superstitious rites, have alternately acted as cause and effect in reducing their numbers and exasperating their condition.

"If we look closer to the constitution of the Indian mind, and his domestic habits ; to his proverbial indolence and improvidence, to his blind devotion to a dark and wild belief in sorcery and magic, and the paralyzing effects of the doctrine of fatalism, we shall see other causes of his abasement ; and many of these causes are totally independent of the proximity of a white population."

During the administration of Washington salutary laws were

¹ Schoolcraft, *Historical Sketches of Michigan*, pp 83-85.

² Reference is had to the Indian's experience while in the hunting field.—E.

enacted by Congress for the protection and welfare of the Indian tribes. When Thomas Jefferson assumed the presidential chair he saw the necessity of a general law governing Indian affairs; he was not only a deep student of their nature and peculiarities, but he was also one of the most proficient Indian philologists of his time.

The general law enacted by Congress in 1802 under his auspices, was based upon the most humane and liberal principles which could be devised for the benefit of the red man's race.

Other laws were enacted by Congress subsequently, in the same generous spirit of fairness and equity. If the history of federal legislation be closely studied from the period of the adoption of the constitution down to the present time, the same, with few exceptions, will be found to have been the governing motive in this connection.

The wrongs inflicted upon the unfortunate Indian races by subordinate officials, cannot be charged against the government, nor against its laws, but against the abuse of both by the rapacious and dishonest men in its service, who plundered like pirates and who were accountable for many of the bloody episodes which can be traced to the outrages, the robberies and the unprincipled conduct of the Indian agents of the federal government.

The first of this series of bibliographies, that of the Eskimo language, is that of a people "more widely scattered," writes Pilling in his preface to this work, "and, who, with perhaps two or three exceptions, cover a wider range of territory than those of any other of the linguistic stocks of North America." From Labrador, on the east, their habitations dot the coast line to the Aleutian Islands, on the west, and a dialect of the language is spoken on the coast of northeastern Asia.

As far north as the white man has gone remains of their deserted habitations are found, and southward they extend, on the east coast to latitude 50° and on the west coast to latitude 60°. Within this era a number of dialects are spoken, the principal of which will be found entered herein in their alphabetical order.

The earliest printed record of the languages known to me is the Greenland vocabulary in the two editions of Olearius's voyage of 1656.¹

The earliest treatise on the language is found in the various editions of Hans Egede's work on "Greenland," first printed in 1729; the next by Anderson in 1746. The earliest text met with is Egede's "Four Gospels," printed at Copenhagen in 1744.²

¹ Adam Olearius was the Danish secretary of the embassy sent by the Duke of Holstein to the Grand Duke of Muscovy and Persia in 1633-9.

² Hans Egede, was a Norwegian Lutheran missionary bishop in Greenland, as was also his son Paul, who succeeded him in the same work.

The first text in the dialect of Labrador of which mention is made herein is the "Harmony of the Gospels," printed in Barbeine in 1800, the translator of which is unknown to the compiler.

Veniaminoff and Netzvietoff, in the extreme west, translated and issued a number of texts between 1840 and 1848; also a dictionary of the Aleut in 1846.

The only texts of the Eskimo of the middle stretch of country are those of the "Hudson Bay Company."

The Moravians under the patronage of Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, began missions in Greenland in the seventeenth century, and still continue their missionary work.

The second of the series of bibliographies is that of the Siouan languages; which, says the compiler in his preface, cover a wider range than those of any other linguistic group of North America, including the whole Bible, school books, periodicals, etc. Nearly every dialect is represented in print or in manuscript, either by dictionaries or extensive vocabularies, and, of five of the languages at least, somewhat pretentious grammars have been prepared.

The earliest record of Siouan languages mentioned herein is the vocabulary of Hennepin, compiled about 1680.

This work is noted as follows:

"Hennepin, Rev. (Father) Louis. Dictionary of the Dakota language. 1680. Manuscript."

"When once I had got the word *Tahetchiaben*, which signifies in their language, *How call you this?* I began soon to be able to talk of such things as are most familiar. This difficulty was hard to surmount at first, because there was no Interpreter who understood both Tongues. For example, if I had a mind to know what "to run" was in their tongue, I was forced to mend my pace, and indeed actually to run from one end of the cabin to the other, till they understood what I meant, and had told me the word which I presently sat down in my dictionary."¹

Father Mazzuchelli, who under the auspices of Father Gabriel Richard successfully labored in the missionary field on the shores of Lake Michigan, is credited by Pilling with being the first to publish a text in any of the Siouan languages which is noted as follows:

Mazzuchelli, Rev. Samuel. Ocangra Aramee Wawakakara, or Winnebago Prayer Book. (Three lines quotation in Winnebago.) "Waiastanoeca," 1833. George L. Whitney, Printer, Detroit. Title verse blank, one leaf, prayers, pp. 3-9. Hymns, pp. 10-14. Catechism, pp. 15-16; alphabet and numerals, p. 17; words of one syllable, etc., p. 18. 16°. The text is entirely in the Winnebago

¹ Hennepin in *Siouan Bibliography*, pp. 34-35.

language. This is the first publication as far as I know, of a text in any of the dialects of the Siouan family. Copies seen: Boston Athenæum.—Powell.¹

One of the last European editions of Father P. J. de Smet, S. J., is thus noted:

SMET, P. J. DE, *Cinquante Nouvelle Lettres* due R. P. de Smet, de la Compagnie de Jésus et Missionnaire en Amérique, publiées par Ed. Terwecoren, de la même Compagnie. (Two lines quotation).

Paris, Rue de Tournon, 20. Tournai Rue aux Rats, 11, H. Castelman Editeur. 1858.

Pp. i-ix, 1-503, 12°.—Lord's prayer and Ave Maria in Osage, with interlinear French translation, p. 319. Names of Sioux chiefs, translated, p. 107. Names of Sioux and Otoe delegates, translated, p. 99. Copies seen: British Museum.¹

Bishop Marty's baptismal card is thus noted:

MARTY, BISHOP MARTIN. Teton baptismal card. 1885. An 18° card in the Teton dialect of the Dakota language, given by Bishop Marty, to the Indians who are received into his Church.

Below the spaces for entering name, date of birth, of baptism, etc., is the Apostles' creed. On the reverse side of the card are the commandments of God and the Church, in verse, as sung by the Catholic children, with heading as follows.

"Tuwe mini akastanpi kin he wokonze kin hena opa kta iyecetu, the literal translation of which is: Who water they pour on him the that law the those follow with right." Copies seen: Powell, Shea.

The third, and not the least interesting of the series, is the Iroquoian; which embraces a wide field, and recalls the memory of one of the most brilliant periods in the history of the Catholic Church in North America.

After a critical study by the director and his collaborators, in this bureau, it was decided that the Cherokee language, belonged to the Iroquoian stock, and its literature has been incorporated in this work, of which its compiler writes in his preface: "There are in the present catalogue 949 titular entries, of which 795 relate to printed books and articles and 154 to manuscripts. Of these 856 have been seen and described by the compiler—751 of the prints and 105 of the manuscripts. Of those unseen by the writer, titles and descriptions of more than three-fourths of the former and nearly half of the latter have been received from persons who have actually seen the works and described them for him.

In addition to these, there are given 64 full titles of printed covers, second and third volumes, etc., all of which have been

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 50.

² *Siouan Bibliography*, p. 70.

seen and described by the compiler; while in the notes mention is made of 134 printed works, 90 of which have been seen and 44 derived from other (mostly printed) sources.

The languages most largely represented in these pages are the Mohawk and Cherokee, more material having been published in these two than in all the others combined.

Of manuscripts mention is made of a greater number in Mohawk than in any other of the languages.

Of grammars, we have printed in Cherokee that of Gabelentz and the unfinished one by Pickering; in Mohawk, Cuq's "*Études Philologiques*" and his "*Jugement erroné*," and in manuscript, the rather extensive treatise by Marcoux; in Huron, that by Chaumonot, in print, and a number of manuscripts by various reverend fathers. In most of the remaining languages, also, mention is made of more or less extensive grammatic treatises, either in print or in manuscript.

In dictionaries, the more important in print are those of the Huron, by Sagard; the Mohawk by Bruyas and by Cuq; and the Onondaga, edited by Dr. Shea. In the Seneca mention is made of one manuscript dictionary, and in the Tuscarora of two.

One of the latter, that by Mr. Hewitt, will, when finished, be, by far, the most extensive we now have knowledge of in any of the Iroquoian languages.

Of Cherokee texts in Roman characters but two will be found mentioned herein, both of them spelling-books; the one by Buttrick & Brown, printed in 1819, the other by Wofford, printed in 1824—both issued before the invention of the Cherokee syllabary.

To the Iroquoian, perhaps, belongs the honor of being the first of our American families of languages to be placed upon record—at any rate, it is the first of which we have any positive knowledge, the vocabularies appearing in the account of Cartier's second voyage to America, published at Paris in 1545, antedating all other publications touching this subject except the pseudo-"*Mexican Doctrinæ Christianæ*" of 1528 and 1539.

It is probable, indeed, that a printed record of some of Cartier's linguistics was made earlier than 1545.

The second voyage, in the account of which the vocabularies mentioned above appeared, was made in 1535, and the first voyage in 1534.

No copy of the first edition of the account of the first voyage is known to exist, and although we cannot fix the date of its publication, it is fair to assume that it appeared previous to the account of the second voyage. It is also fair to assume that it contained a vocabulary of the people of New France, as the first translation

of it, appearing in Ramusio's "Navigations and Voyages," in 1556, does contain such a vocabulary.¹

We shall give, according to priority of dates, the compiler's notes of such of the prints or manuscripts as have been given a place in the Iroquoian bibliography, beginning with that of Jacques Cartier. It is a fac-simile of the title of the "first printed account known to exist" of the languages of the Indians of North America. It is taken from the only copy known to exist, which is in the British Museum.

"BRIEF RECIT, &
succincte narration, de la nauiga-
tion faicte es yfles de Canada,
Hochelage & Saugenay &
autres, avec particulieres meurs,
language, & cerimonies des
habitans d'icelles: fort delectable
a veoir.

(Emblematic device.)
Avec priuilege.

On les uend à Paris au second
pillier en le grand falle du palais,
et en le rue neufue noltredame
à l'enseigne de lefcu de frâce, par
Ponce Roffet dict faucheur, &
Anthoine le Clerc-freres,

1545.

Title verso "A Monseignor le preuost de Paris," etc. 1 leaf. Av Roy tres Chrestien. 4 leaves (Aii, Aiii, Aiii), the fourth with no signature number; the first leaf is not numbered, the others 3, 3, 5); text leaves, 5-48 (leaf 6 is misnumbered 7, which number is duplicated on the proper leaf). 16°. Ensuyt le lagage (Huron) des pays & Royaulmes de Hochelaga & Canada, aultrement appelles par nous la nouuelle France. Verso of leaf 46 to verso of leaf 48 contains: Premier leur nombre de compter; verso leaf 46: Ensuyt les noms des parties du corps de l'hóme; leaves 46 (verso) —48 verso.

The compiler remarks: "The first edition of Cartier's 'Relations,' 1545, has been so rare that but a single copy has been known to exist for nearly 300 years."

Notes follow of 14 other editions of the same work in European languages.

In 1609 Marc L'Escarbot published "A Paris chez Jean Milot, tenant sa boutique sur les degrez de la grand salle du Palais. Avec priuilege dv Roy: Histoire de la Novvelle France, etc," which is described, containing Huron numerals, vocabulary, etc.

¹ *Bibliography of the Iroquoian Languages*; preface, pp. iv.-vi.

It is a rare book, costing 1200 francs. *Copies seen*: British Museum, Brown-Lennox. 888 pp. 16°.

In 1630, "Doctrine Chrestienne du Rev Pere Ledesme, S. J." was translated into the Huron language by Father Jean de Brebauf, S. J.—"Pour la Conuersion des habitans Canadois." A Rouen chez Richard l'Allement pres le College." Pp. 1-26. 16°.

The compiler describes 5 later editions of the same work, all intended for the Huron mission, with the fathers' subsequent works, 1627, 1640.

The Recollect brother, Sagard, is noted as follows:

"Sagard, Frère Gabriel."—Theodat.

"Le grand voyage dv pays des Hurons, situé en L'Amerique uers la mer douce ez dernieres confins de la nouuelle France. Ou il est traicte de tout es qui est du pays & du gouuernement des sauages. Avec un dictionnaire de la langue huronne. Par Fr. Gabriel Sagard, Recollect de la Prouince St Denis.

"A Paris chez Deny's Moreau rue St Jacques a 'La Salamandre 1632."

Nearly a column follows of the author's description of the work. "*Copies seen*: Astor, British Museum, Brown-Harvard, Lennox, Shea." Brother Sagard is still further noted in 6 later editions, translations and reprints.

A liberal notice is given of the work in the Dutch language published in Amsterdam in 1644, of Dominie Megopolensis, the Dutch pastor of Albany, which contains some Mohawk phrases.

These with other notices, are embraced in the period of the Huron Missions, including the Jesuit Relations of the time.

The period of the Iroquoian Missions is rich in manuscripts.

A note of Father Jacques Bruyas's linguistic work in manuscript of the Mohawk dialect is as follows:

"Bruyas, Rev. Jacques. Radices
verborum Iroquoerum Auctore
Rev. P. Jacobo Bruyas, Societatis Jesu.
Neo-Eboraci. Typis John Gilmary Shea 1863.
Second title. Radical words of the Mohawk
language with their derivatives.
By Rev. James Bruyas, S. J. Missionary
on the Mohawk. New York: Cramoisy
Press, 1862."

"The present volume," writes Dr. Shea, "was written evidently in the latter part of the seventeenth century, and most probably on the banks of the Mohawk. It is a closely-written manuscript of 116 pages which has long been preserved in the Mission House at Caughnawaga, or Sault St. Louis, near Montreal, adding to the interest of the room where Charlevoix and Lafitau wrote." Dr. Shea then described the nature and scope of the work.

"The description of the New Netherlands," with some account

of the Iroquoian dialects, published at Amsterdam, 1655, in the Dutch language, with two fac-similes of title pages and extensive descriptive notes have been given by the compiler.

Full descriptions are given of Father Chaumonot's linguistic manuscripts, of a number of French and Huron dictionaries, grammars, devotional works, and other manuscripts designed for the use of missionaries, all of which were written in the seventeenth century and are preserved in the archives of Canadian churches, missions and colleges.

The most precious collections of authentic manuscripts of this century having reference to the evangelization of the Iroquoian races, to their language and to historic events of the times, are to be found at Caughnawaga, in the archives of the Archbishopric of Quebec; of the Laval University; of the Church at Oka Lake of the Two Mountains; but probably the most valuable authentic, as well as official of the Jesuit fathers, are in the archives of St. Mary's College, Montreal, which were exhibited and explained to us recently by Father Alfred E. Jones, S. J., archivist of this college, who is engaged in writing a history of his order in North America during the old régime, which we hope will soon be published.

The opening period of the eighteenth century in this series, is marked by a very liberal space devoted to precise and extended notices of the Baron de La Hontan's voyages and books, which cover nearly seven pages. "Truth and fiction," according to Appleton's "Cyclopædia of American Biography," "are so blended in his works they have long since ceased to have any authority."

After the last of the Jesuit Missions in the Iroquoian cantons had been broken up by the intrigues of the English colonial governors, a crusade for the conversion to the Church of England of the Iroquoian people of the league, was organized in London by the *Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts*, and several English missionaries were sent to the field of operations. About all that remains of this crusade is offered by the compiler in two fac-similes of title pages, the one in English and the other in the Mohawk dialect entitled:

"Ne
Orhoengene neoni Yogaraskhagh
Yondereanaydagh kwa,
N. E. Ene Niyoh Raodeweyena,
Onoghfadogeghtige yondader—
ighwanondoentha
Siyagonnogh-fode. Enyonderecanay-Endagh—
kwagge.

Yotkade capilel hogough ne Karighwadaghk weah Agayea neoni ale Testament, neoni Niyadegaríwagge, ne Kanninggahaga Siuiyewenoteagh. Printed by William Bradford, in New York

This work is by "Lawrence Claesse, *interpreter* to William Andrews, missionary to the Indians." The title page has an English translation on the left as has also the text, which is minutely described, with two columns of fine printed detail and memoir. It is a small quarto of 115 pages, and was seen in the British Museum and in New York; a fine old half-calf gilt; a "tall" copy brought \$112.

A notice of Father Étienne de Carheil, who was at Michilimacine early in the eighteenth century, by Dr. Shea, in his "Missions" is quoted as follows :

"Father Stephen de Carheil born at Rennes Nov. 10, 1633, arrived at Quebec on the 6th of August 1666, and was immediately placed with the Hurons, who gave him the name of Aondechéte. After his expulsion from Cayuga (during the Iroquoian missions) he was sent to the Ottawa mission and labored there for many years. As a philologist he was remarkable. He spoke Huron and Cayuga with the greatest elegance and he composed valuable works in and upon both, some of which are still extant.

"Returning to Quebec, he died there in July 1726."

The works of Father Lafitau which is probably among the authorities most frequently cited, is noted as follows :

"Lafitau, Père Joseph Francois-Moeurs des sauvages Américains, comparé des premiers temps.

"Par la Pere Lafitau de la Compagnie de Jésus. Ouvrage enrichi de figures entaille-douce. Tome 1-2 (Design.) A Paris chez Saugrain l'aîné, Quay des Augustins, près la rue Parée, à la Fleur de Lys.

"Charles Estienne Hochereau, à la entrée du Quay des Augustins, a la descente du Pont S. Michel au Phoenix, 1724. Avec approbation et privilège du Roy. 2 vols. 1 leaf. pp. 1-610. 1 leaf; 6 p. 1-499-table 20 leaves 4°.

"De la Langue (vol. 2, pp. 458-490) is a general discussion on ancient languages as compared with the modern, treating of American languages, and the Huron particularly." Copies seen: Astor, Boston Athenæum, British Museum, etc. A later edition in French and one in Dutch is noted.

Charlevoix is thus noted :

"Pierre François Xavier de, Histoire et description générale de la Nouvelle France, avec la journal historique d'un voyage fait par ordre du Roy dans l'Amérique Septentrionale. Par le Rev. P. de Charlevoix, de la Compagnie de Jésus. Tome premier-troisième. À Paris. Chez Nyon Fils, Libraire, Quai des Augustins, à l'Occasion. 1744. Avec privilège et approbation du Roy."

Then follows a critical description of the three volumes, and in what libraries they had been seen. Other works of Father de Charlevoix are also described in a similar manner.

Cadwallader Colden's history of the Five Nations follows, with descriptive notes of the original edition, printed in New York, 1727; the London editions of 1747, 1750, and 1755. The Cramoisy press reprint of the first edition, by Dr. Shea, New York, 1866, is fully described.

After the fall of Montcalm, and prior to the American Revolution, Sir William Johnson sought to evangelize the Mohawks, and introduced missionaries of the Established Church, who attempted, with the aid of others, to compile a book of Mohawk prayers, printed in New York in 1769. The revolutionary period demoralized this missionary work, as it did, in fact, the Mohawk and others of the Iroquoian league, and broke up their confederacy. Later in the century, 1790, the Moravians published in Leipzig an account of their American missionary work, and about the same time, Luigi Castiglioni published in Italian, in Milan, an edition of two volumes, giving vocabularies of the Cherokee and Choctaw dialects.

A fac-simile of the title-page is given of:

A

Primmer for the USE of the MOHAWK CHILDREN:

To acquire the spelling and reading of their own :
As well as to get acquainted with the English
Tongue, which, for that purpose, is put on
the opposite page.

WA E R I C H W A G H S A W E—I K S A
O N G O E N W A—Tsiwaondad—derigb—
honny Kaghy adoghsera; Nayonde—
weyestaghk ayeweanagh nodon—
a yeghyadow kaniyenhehaga Kaw—
eanondaghkough; Dyorheas—haga
oni tsin hadiweanotea.

Montreal. Printed at Fleury Mesplets.

1781.

This primer is minutely described. Pp. 99. The only known copy is in the British Museum, from which the fac-simile was taken. It was reprinted in London, 1786, and a description of this edition given. Among its contents described in the text, are: "Questions and answers, from an old manuscript of the first missionaries to the Mohawk Indians, never printed before in Mohawk; a morning and an evening prayer." The work is evidently of Protestant origin. It is scarce; the English edition having been sold in New York for \$40.

In the closing years of the eighteenth century, appeared the editions of William Bartram's travels, and description of the Indians in North and South Carolina, Georgia, east and west Florida,

the Cherokee country, the Creek confederacy, and the country of the Choctaws; in fact, all that part of the United States which comprised the several fields of the Spanish missions during the sixteenth century in the Southern States. Printed in Philadelphia in 1791. Seven later editions of the same work, Philadelphia, Dublin, London, and Paris, are described and fully noted.

Turning from the printed works of the eighteenth century, we shall notice some of the precious manuscripts of that epoch which the compiler has carefully noted. We have stated that the archives of the church at Oka, Lake of the Two Mountains, in the archdiocese of Montreal, is rich in manuscripts. For nearly a century Oka has been the centre of an Indian population composed of Christian Iroquois and Algonquins.

The Sulpitian Father, Jean Claude Mathevet, who was missionary at Oka for thirty-five years, 1746-1781, has left a series of manuscript sermons in the Mohawk language, a list of which was furnished the compiler by Father Leclaire, who had been stationed at Oka, and by Mrs. Erminnie A. Smith. There are upwards of fifty in the vernacular; the reading of the titles alone is edifying; besides these, several manuscript works of considerable value written by Father Mathevet have disappeared from the archives. Fifty sermons in the Mohawk dialect, all carefully written and legible, tells of the zeal and linguistic ability of this holy priest. The title of one of these Mohawk sermons, as given in French, is *Femme n'aller pas à Montreal*. This was probably written at the time when this city, after the conquest, was what might be termed a garrison-town.

Probably the most perfect and beautifully written manuscripts, which, after the lapse of nearly one hundred and fifty years, are clear and distinct, written by Catholic priests during the eighteenth century, are those of Father Pierre Potier, S. J., last of the Huron missionaries, who died at the old mission-house of the Jesuits, the centre of the Huron mission, on the Canadian shore, opposite the city of Detroit, in 1761. This house, built in 1738 and enlarged in 1748, is still standing. Dr. Shea said of Father Potier's manuscripts, that they "were written in an almost microscopic hand." They appear on the page more slightly than the prints of the period in which they were written, and although the paper has become yellow by time the ink has remained black.

"Potier, Père Pierre. Grammar of the Huron language. Manuscript; no title-page; contents, 1 leaf; text, pp. 1-213, 12°."

The hand-writing is admirable, small and compact, and perfectly legible, and the manuscript, bound in leather, is well preserved.

The author has written his rules and notes in Latin, while the

equivalents of the Mohawk examples usually appear in French, though occasionally in Latin. On page 1 appears the heading "Elementa graminaticæ huronicæ," and the principal divisions of the work are as follows: Index rerum, prel. 1. De litteris, pp. 1-2. De verbus, pp. 2-62. De syntax, pp. 63-65. De adverbiiis, pp. 67-75. De præpositionibus, pp. 76-78. Pronomina, etc., pp. 79-81. Quaedam adverbia, pp. 82-98. Pp. 99-102 are blank. Quædam substantiva, pp. 103-171. Pages 172-174 are blank.

Miscellanea, consisting of: Partes hominis, Parenté, Animaux, etc., pp. 175-194. Census of the Village Huron de L'isle aux bois-blanc en 1747, and of other villages and bands, pp. 195-201. Pages 202-208 are blank.

Varia, consisting of: Nations sauvages, Nations policées, Places aux Français, Places Aux Anglais, Rivières, Pointes, etc., 209-213.¹

Father Potier wrote duplicate copies of this grammar. The duplicate of the copy described was shown to us by Father Alfred E. Jones, S. J., archivist of St. Mary's College, Montreal, in whose archives are other precious Potier manuscripts.

One in particular is exceedingly interesting, being a species of daily journal, wanting some leaves, which were cut out after the episode of Pontiac's siege of Detroit on account of their compromising contents, for the good father was on the most intimate terms with Meloche and other Frenchmen, who were fast friends of the Ottawa ruler. The Jesuit fathers refuse to have this manuscript copied or translated on account of several droll and witty allusions made in his diary by Father Potier at the expense of the Bishop of Quebec.²

¹ The manuscript above described by Mr. Pilling belonged to the late James V. Campbell, of Detroit, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Michigan. It had been in his possession for a quarter of a century, and it was dearly prized by the judge, not only on account of its chirographical beauty, its minuteness and accuracy, but also on account of its historical interest in connection with the French history of Detroit, for it was written at the Huron Mission, directly opposite Detroit. Under pretence that he wanted to copy some portion of the manuscript, a certain party who had been employed by Mr. Douglas Brimmer, Archivist of the Dominion Government at Ottawa, to take copies of the parochial registers at Mackinac and Sandwich, obtained the precious relic from Judge Campbell, *but he never returned it*; and although great efforts were made to ascertain its whereabouts, it could never be traced; meantime, the party mentioned died. It was he who loaned it to Mr. Pilling. But to whom he sold the manuscript is still a mystery. Should these lines ever be read by the possessor of Father Potier's Huron grammar, he is entreated to return it to Detroit, where it belongs, and he will be thankfully reimbursed for any outlay he may have made, innocently, when purchasing it.

² For an account of Father Potier, see the translation of *Livre des Comptes de la Mission des Hurons du Detroit, 1733-1751*, by the writer, the first part of which has been published in the *United States Catholic Historical Magazine*, April, 1892. This is one of the most valuable, interesting, and beautiful of the Jesuits' manuscripts of the eighteenth century in existence.

Probably no more valuable collateral evidence could be produced attesting the zeal, the piety, and the learning of the Catholic priesthood, both secular and regular, who during the eighteenth century were in charge of established missions, and serving the spiritual care and instruction of North American Indian tribes, than the manuscripts preserved in the religious and educational institutional archives of the Dominion of Canada.

In the archives of the church at Caughnawaga, on the River St. Lawrence, among the precious collections there relating to the last century, may be mentioned those of Father Antoine Rinfret, comprising one hundred and thirty-two sermons in the Mohawk language, quarto in size, nicely written and well preserved, the titles or subjects of each of which are minutely described by the compiler. This was a work accomplished during the sacerdotal lifetime of this priest, who, from his ordination in 1781, was pastor of the Indian congregations at Caughnawaga, St. Regis, and Lachine.

After the close of the War of 1812, all through the present century and down to the present day, when the work of a missionary among the Indians had ceased to be perilous and was unattended with the privations which were experienced during the previous century, a great number of printed books in the Indian tongues embraced in the Iroquoian bibliography have appeared. Very many of these have been printed by denominational, bible, tract, and missionary societies both in America and in Europe.

Among prominent works meriting notice are those of Father Joseph Marcoux, who, from the time of his ordination at Quebec, in 1813, until 1819, was missionary to the Mohawks at St. Regis, and from the latter date at Caughnawaga until his death in May, 1855. The compiler describes these works, the first of which, in the Mohawk tongue, was published by Lane & Bowman in Montreal, 1886. It is a prayer-book entirely in the Mohawk language. This book was dedicated to Chateaubriand, and copies of it are exceedingly rare, the compiler having the copy above described. Ten later printed books of a devotional nature are described in the Mohawk language and several valuable manuscripts, which are in the archives of Caughnawaga and Oka.

Dr. Shea has been a distinguished contributor to the material of the Iroquoian bibliography directly and incidentally in his historical and missionary works, and so has Dr. Edmund Burke O'Callaghan, who edited the documentary history of New York.

Rev. John André Cuog, pastor of the church of Oka at the present time, who is not only proficient in the Iroquoian but also in the Algonquian languages, has published several devotional works in the Mohawk language, of which ten are noted and de-

scribed. "In addition to which," writes the compiler, "he has composed an equal or greater number in the Nipissing dialect of the Algonkin. His modesty has prevented me from carrying out my desire to give a somewhat extended notice of him and his work."

The "Bibliography of the Algonquian Languages," which is not only the most extensive of the series and interesting from a Catholic standpoint, will be considered in a subsequent article.

RICHARD R. ELLIOTT.

THE AGE OF THE HUMAN RACE ACCORDING TO MODERN SCIENCE AND BIBLICAL CHRONOLOGY.

PART III.

THE ANTIQUITY OF MAN ACCORDING TO PREHISTORIC ARCHÆOLOGY.

BUT the argument of all others in favor of man's great antiquity is that founded on the gradual and peculiar evolution of the industrial arts, the conclusiveness of which argument most archæologists consider as now beyond dispute. During the last few decades especially, this argument has had a special interest attached to it, and a new force given it, on account of the numerous and important finds made not only in Europe but also in America. Various objects of human industry, of ancient but uncertain date, tools, weapons and implements of divers kinds employed by primitive man, have been unearthed and compared, and the result arrived at, we are informed, has been that the teachings of history and the Bible anent the age of our species, have to be either greatly modified or altogether abandoned.

We saw in the beginning of this paper that Hesiod, together with the majority of the earlier Greek and Oriental writers regarded mankind as having descended from a higher to a lower plane, that the men of the later periods of the world's history were degraded or decivilized, to use a more expressive word, in comparison with those who lived happy and God-like lives in the Golden Age of humanity's first beginnings.

Archæologists divide the first period of human history into

three ages, called in the order of succession, the Stone Age, the Bronze Age, and the Iron Age. These ages have, by certain writers been divided into a greater or less number of sub-ages, but we shall here retain the division just given, which was the one adopted by Danish archæologists when the foundations of the science of prehistoric archæology were first laid.¹

If the evolution theory of the origin of man and of the development of civilization be true, we should expect to find the archæological division universally true and apply equally to all peoples in all parts of the world. But is this a fact? An answer to this question necessarily precedes a reply to the query regarding the antiquity of the human species.

There does not seem to be any doubt that in certain parts of Europe, perhaps throughout the greater portion of it, the Stone Age preceded the Ages of Bronze and Iron. The reason for this belief is that the earliest implements met with are invariably of stone, at first rough and rude, but at a later date, often beautifully polished and of delicate workmanship. With these are also found implements of horn and bone, which, in lieu of metal, constituted for primitive man the chief if not the sole materials available for the manufacture of the simple tools and weapons necessary for purposes of defence or for hunting beasts of the chase. In localities marked by several successive civilizations we frequently, but not always, find a series of deposits, the lowest of which contain only stone implements, those immediately above bronze, while the last in the order of time are characterized by the occurrence, in greater or less numbers, of implements of iron.

It would be a mistake, however, to imagine that the Stone Age marks a fixed period in human history, and that it prevailed at the same time in all lands and among all peoples. Nothing could be farther from the truth. While one nation, or one tribe was living in the Age of Stone, its next neighbor may have been enjoying the advantages of the Age of Bronze or of Iron. Even now in all the effulgence of the much-vaunted civilization of the nineteenth century the Stone Age still continues in some parts of the world. To give only a few instances, it still persists in some

¹ The division of primitive time into periods of stone, bronze and iron, although brought into general use by the Danish archæologists, notably E. C. Thomsen, is not of modern origin. It occurs in a book written by one Goguet nearly a century and a half ago. More than this; the same division is found in the *De Rerum Natura* of the Roman poet Lucretius. His words are:

"Arma antiqua manus, ungues dentesque fuerunt
Et lapides. . . .
Posterius ferri vis est ærisque recepta,
Et prior æris erat quam ferri cognitus usus,
Quo facilis magis est natura et copia major."

of the islands of the South Pacific, among the Fuegians, the Esquimaux and certain other tribes of the Pacific coast of North America. Even in Europe the use of stone for implements was not abandoned until a comparatively recent period, if indeed it can even now be said to be entirely discarded. According to two archæologists of recognized authority, Lartet and Christy, weapons and tools of stone were employed by the inhabitants of western Europe until the Roman invasion, and probably until a later period. Records of undoubted authenticity tell us that flint hatchets and stone battle-axes were used from the fifth to the seventh century. At a much later epoch—about the year 920—according to Irish chronicles, stone projectiles were employed in a battle against the Danes near Limerick. Similar projectiles, we are informed, were used at the battle of Hastings in 1066. More than this, there is every reason to believe that over a century later, in 1298, stone weapons were employed by the Scottish soldiery under Wallace. In Japan the Age of Stone and Bronze lasted until the present century and in parts of China it still endures.

If there is no fixed period in time for the Stone Age, neither is there a hard and fast line of demarcation between the Age of Stone and that of Bronze, or between the Age of Bronze and that of Iron. They frequently overlap one another, and are, in many instances even quite synchronous. This is especially so in the case of the Age of polished Stone and the Age of Bronze. Indeed, to so great an extent is this true that many eminent archæologists have not hesitated to declare that implements of polished stone and bronze must be referred to one and the same Age. Thus the distinguished Dutch archæologist, M. Leemans, denies the distinction between the Age of Bronze and the Age of Stone in Holland. And M. Alexandre Bertrand, one of the most eminent of French archæologists, at the Congress of Archæologists held a few years ago at Stockholm, declared that "There was in reality no Age of Bronze in Italy and Gaul."

Again; it would be equally wide of the truth to assert, as is so often done, that all peoples passed through the three phases of civilization indicated by the Ages of Stone, Bronze and Iron. This is so far from being the case that numerous instances are citable where there are but two Ages, and sometimes even not more than one. M. Bertrand in referring to this subject does not hesitate to assert that "this absolute doctrine of the succession of three Ages, which has been proclaimed a law without exception, is, in our opinion, the opposite of the truth."¹

¹ *Revue Archéologique*, p. 334, for the year 1875.

Thus some of the more barbarous tribes of the earth are still in the Stone Age and have never known any other. Again there are others, even in Europe, that have never known a Bronze Age, properly so called, but who passed directly from the Stone to the Iron Age. In some parts of the world the Ages of Stone and Bronze have been synchronous; in others those of Bronze and Iron. In still others, notably in parts of Western Asia, we have evidence of the contemporaneous use of stone, bronze and iron from time immemorial. From the fact that stone, bronze and iron implements are found together in Chaldean tombs and Assyrian ruins, and that too from the earliest dawn of the human period, archæologists of note have inferred that neither Chaldea nor Assyria ever knew the Ages of Bronze and Iron as distinct from that of Stone. M. Oppert declares that Babylonia and Assyria had neither a Bronze nor an Iron Age, while M. Chabas rejects altogether the distinction of the three Ages for Egypt. But more remarkable still, we find that in the case of the majority of the tribes of Africa, excluding the Egyptians, the only age that has ever existed is the Age of Iron. Stone has been used, and is still employed, but from the most remote period that archæology has been able to reach, iron has been in common use, while bronze has been entirely unknown. Dr. Livingston in his interesting "Narrative of an Expedition to the Zambesi and its Tributaries," informs us that no flints are found in this part of the "Dark Continent," and that there are no indications whatever of a Stone Age. So universally is iron used for tools and weapons that rude furnaces for smelting it are met with in every third or fourth village, and the metal here produced is preferred by the natives to that imported from England.¹

Yet more. Not only are the distinctions based on the existence of the "Three Ages," vague and misleading; not only do the Ages vary in time and place, being earlier in some countries and later in others; lasting for long and indefinite periods among some peoples, and being among others of short duration, but there is also a more important fact to be noted, one indeed, that is entirely subversive of the evolution theory of primitive man.

According to the brilliant reseaches of Dr. Schliemann at Hisarlik, the site of ancient Troy, and at Mycenæ, there was neither a Stone Age nor a Metal Age in Greece and Asia Minor. More than this; the arguments that the evolution school of archæology has based on the development of civilization, as attested by the alleged gradual transition from the use of stone to that of bronze and from bronze to iron, is here decidedly negated. In the finds at Troy especially, there is the most striking evidence of devolu-

¹ Pp. 561 *et seq.*

tion, or degeneration of the inhabitants who successively occupied this historic spot. Here, as well as at Mycenæ, the ornaments and implements discovered even in the lowest strata, far from indicating a state of savagery and utter degradation, betokens one of high civilization, and of as thorough an acquaintance with the working of metals and the fictile arts as was displayed at subsequent periods. In the light of Schliemann's discoveries, not to speak of others pointing in the same direction, made in Egypt, and among the ruins of Assyria and Babylonia, bearing on the condition of primitive man in the Orient, the conclusion seems to be inevitable that Hesiod was right, and that the modern evolution school is wrong—that the history of our race is not one of development, but one of degeneration. Thus the story of the Fall as recorded in Holy Writ, is corroborated by the declarations of the newest of the sciences—which is but of yesterday—prehistoric archæology.¹

The chronological system of the Scandinavian archæologists has been prolific of other errors besides those just enumerated. It has, for instance, assumed that primeval man understood the manufacture and use of bronze before he had learned the art of smelting iron. In the opinion, however, of the most expert metallurgists this view is so impossible that it borders on the absurd. Thus Mr. John Percy, one of the ablest metallurgists of the age, declares that from the point of view of metallurgy the Age of Bronze should precede that of Iron. "When archæologists," he tells us, "maintain the contrary, they should remember that iron by its very nature cannot be preserved in the earth so long as bronze." Col. Tschering, a Dane, as the result of long experience in the manufacture of ordnance, stated emphatically at a recent Archæological Congress at Copenhagen, that a knowledge of iron should date back much further than that of bronze, for the reason that the latter is much more difficult to prepare than the former, and requires the employment of iron or steel tools. "So undoubted is this fact," declares Hostmann in his criticism of the "three age theory," "that it would involve a contradiction of all our technical knowledge to admit that objects of bronze have been fabricated by means of bronze tools. Such teaching is the disgrace of contemporary archæology."²

¹ It is well to state here, once for all, that the word *prehistoric* does not have the absolute signification so often attributed to it by certain archæologists. It refers to that which is anterior only to *local* history, and not that which is prior to all history. Everything in America is prehistoric that antedates the discovery of the country by Europeans. It is evident, therefore, that certain objects found in one part of the world may be classed as prehistoric, while similar objects in other countries would be regarded as historic.

² Quoted in the *Revue des Questions Scientifiques*, p. 256, July, 1880.

The bronze used in Europe in prehistoric times and even much of that which was used in historic times was an imported product. It was undoubtedly brought by the Phœnicians, the great manufacturing and trading nation of the ancient world, and given in exchange for other articles of commerce. So well attested is this fact that it cannot, we think, be disputed. The use of bronze, therefore, in parts of northern and western Europe, prior to the use of iron in these same portions of the world, does not, then, as many have erroneously imagined, prove that man acquired the art of working bronze sooner than he did that of producing iron, but simply that with the Phœnicians bronze wares were more common articles of merchandise than those of iron.

As to the time that has elapsed since the beginning and the close of Stone, Bronze and Iron Ages, it may readily be surmised that the most diverse and extravagant views have obtained. Of these we shall have nothing to say, but shall confine ourselves to a brief consideration of facts that are known to be authentic and to conclusions that may be accepted as most probable.

The Age of Iron, even according to those who claim a great antiquity for our race, was posterior to the alleged Age of Bronze. But when in European countries was the Age of Bronze ushered in, and when did it close? A satisfactory answer to this question is of paramount importance, because it is the pivot on which turns much of the controversy regarding the antiquity of man.

What has just been stated regarding the bronze traffic of Phœnician traders, together with what history tells us concerning the mining for tin by the Phœnicians in the Cassiterides and possibly also in Spain, supplies us with a key for the solution of all apparent difficulties.

The period of commercial prosperity for Phœnicia, when her ships—those famous “ships of Tarshish”—sailed all known seas, and her merchants carried on traffic with the inhabitants of the most distant lands, and even with those of far-off Scandinavia, it is thought, extended approximately from the twelfth to the fifth century before the Christian era. And this is the epoch, according to the latest and most reliable researches, during which the many objects of bronze, mostly of Phœnician design and manufacture, there is reason to believe, were distributed over western, central and northern Europe. This would place the so-called Bronze Age in the neighborhood of 1000 years B.C. But this probably is assigning it a maximum antiquity. From observations made on alluvial deposits at the mouth of the Loire, M. Kerviler fixes the beginning of the Bronze Age at 500 B.C. The stratification of the alluvium at this point, indicates in the most remarkable way the annual rate of accretion, and furnishes the nearest approach to a

reliable geologic chronometer of anything yet discovered. For this reason and because they agree so well with the teachings of history, we may regard M. Kerviler's conclusions as approximately correct.¹ According to the Danish archæologist, Worsaae, it did not terminate in Denmark until A.D. 200. Bertrand tells us that it prevailed in Germany until the fourth century after Christ, and in Ireland it is known to have lasted until the eighth or ninth century.

As to the Iron Age in Scandinavia, it belonged, if we are to credit two of the ablest authorities on the subject, Desor and Worsaae, to the fourth and six centuries after Christ. The Age of Iron in Gaul dates back to a much earlier period, probably to the fourth century before our era. This is about the time when the Gauls, properly so-called, crossed the Rhine and the Alps, and made themselves masters of eastern France, then occupied by the Celts. Judging from the finds in the celebrated necropolis of Hallstatt, the Iron Age began in Austria one or two centuries earlier.

The Stone Age terminated in Denmark, according to Worsaae about 500 or 600 B.C. This, however, may be questioned, because stone, as is well known, continued in use in Asia Minor until 700 B.C., and in many parts of western Europe, as we have already learned, until a much later period. As the result of an extended series of observations made on the alluvial deposits of the valley of the Saone, M. de Ferry attributes to the Stone Age an antiquity of 9000 or 10,000 years. From similar observations the distinguished French archæologist, Abbé Arcelin, obtains for the Stone Age an antiquity of from 6700 to 8000 years. These figures closely agree with those which historians assign for the beginning of the civilizations of Egypt and Mesopotamia. They are, however, in opposition to those derived from the generally accepted chronology of the Bible, unless, indeed, we admit, as it seems we may, the existence of antediluvian man in Europe, and allow further that he escaped the great cataclysm known as the Noachian Deluge.² It seems impossible otherwise to account for the existence in Europe of the Basques and Finns, whose peculiar ethnological position separates them entirely from the Aryan or Japhetic branch of the human family. Regarding them of Adamic instead of Noachic descent, and admitting that they, as the precursors in Europe of the Celts and Gauls, escaped the devastating waters of the Flood, we have no difficulty, as we shall see in

¹ Southall's *Epoch of the Mammoth*, chap. xxiv.

² See the writer's article on this subject in the *American Ecclesiastical Review* for February, 1893.

the sequel, in reconciling even the high figures of prehistoric archæology with those of scriptural chronology.

But the fact is, it is utterly impossible to arrive at anything even approximating exact dates for any of the three Ages. They are, as we have seen, different for different peoples. In some parts of the world we have only one Age represented, in others two, in others, still, all three. Sometimes they occur in succession; more frequently they overlap one another, very often they are synchronous. For this reason, therefore, to construct a system of chronology based on the implements of stone, bronze and iron that have been used by man in the prehistoric past is, at least in the present state of science, clearly impracticable.

What has been said of the futility of all attempts to arrive at a system of chronology based on the various objects of human industry to which we have referred, obviously applies with equal force to the skulls and other bones of primitive man that have attracted so much attention during the past few decades. They can, no more than the implements of stone and bronze and iron so far discovered, be accepted as evidence of the great antiquity of the human race. Referring to the Canstatt and Neanderthall skulls, about which so much has been written, and the numerous theories based on them, Dr. Brinton, one of the most competent of American archæologists, well observes that "It should be recognized, once for all, that there is no sort of foundation for these dreams. In neither instance did the locality in which these skulls were found guarantee them any high antiquity." The same views were expressed at the meeting last August of the German Anthropological Association "by such speakers as Von Holder, Virchow, Kollman, and Fraas. Their arguments leave no room to doubt the importance of these remains."¹

Of the tumuli and megalithic monuments of Europe, which have been thought to argue so great an antiquity for man, it will suffice to state here that, on closer examination, objects of bronze and relics of the Roman Period have been found in many of them. Even in the oldest of them, in those that archæologists were wont to consider as belonging to the Stone Age, iron is of frequent occurrence. Hence it is safe to affirm that most of these structures, far from having the great age so often attributed to them, postdate the Christian era, and in some instances by several centuries.

The shell-mounds or kitchen-middings that are found in various parts of America and Europe, especially on the eastern coasts of Denmark, are likewise often appealed to as evidences of the great age of our species. Since, however, objects of

¹ "Current Notes on Anthropology," in *Science* for February 10, 1893.

bronze and iron, and articles of undoubted Roman workmanship have been found in many of them, most archæologists have been forced to admit for them a much more recent date, and to allow them "to be taken out of the category of the evidences for the antiquity of man."

About forty years ago special attention was directed by Dr. Keller to the Palafittes or Lake-Dwellings of Switzerland. They were at once seized upon as proof positive of the venerable antiquity of man. Prof. L. Agassiz, in referring to them, some years after their discovery, did not hesitate to assert that "Humanity is now connected with geological phenomena." Further investigation, however, disclosed, even in the oldest of the Lake-Dwellings, traces of copper and bronze, thus showing that they belonged to a recent epoch. Then, too, it was pointed out that the Roman soldiers under Trajan must have encountered pile-dwellers on the lakes of Austria or on the Danube, as they are represented on the celebrated triumphal column of Trajan in Rome. It was remembered, also, that both Herodotus and Hippocrates expressly mention lacustrine villages as existing in their day. The former tells of pile-dwellers who lived on Lake Prasias in Macedonia; the latter describes a similar settlement on the Phasis in Asia Minor. Still later and more careful researches showed conclusively that Lake-Dwellings in various parts of Europe were inhabited during the Middle Ages. In Switzerland there is incontestable evidence of their being occupied as late as the sixth century of our era. M. Chantre has proved that in France "there existed lacustrine habitations down to the Carlovingian Epoch." In the north of Europe, we are told by Prof. Virchow that they were in existence as late as the tenth or the eleventh century, whilst in Ireland, under the name of Crannoges, they are known to have been occupied as late as the sixteenth century. More than this, they are still found in various parts of the world, in equatorial Africa, in the islands of the Pacific, in Venezuela, in New Guinea, in Borneo, and elsewhere. But yet more remarkable is the fact that "the fishermen of Lake Prasias still inhabit wooden cottages over water, as in the days of Herodotus."¹

In view, then, of all these facts, we heartily endorse the words of Mr. W. H. Holmes, of the Smithsonian Institution, when he says that "The whole discussion of early man has been so surcharged with misconceptions of fact and errors of interpretation, that all is vitiated as a stream with impurities about its source. Until an exhaustive scientific study of the origin, form, genesis, and meaning of all the handiwork of man made use of in the dis-

¹ *The Epoch of the Mammoth*, p. 60.

cussion is completed, the discussion of man and culture is worse than useless, and speculation can lead but to embarrassment and disaster."¹

The great difficulty, as already intimated, experienced by scientists in arriving at accordant conclusions respecting the antiquity of our species, arises from the total lack of anything approaching a reliable natural chronometer. The most satisfactory one so far known is, as has been said, that discovered at St. Nazaire, by the French engineer, M. Kerviler. But this has been either ignored or rejected as unavailable by the new school of prehistorians, "because," as Abbé Hamard shrewdly observes, "it labors under the grave inconvenience of harmonizing too closely with the traditional chronology."² The futile attempts to estimate time by the rate of growth of peat, or the deposition of alluvium, or the formation of stalagmites, we have already considered. Arguments based on certain lava deposits, on the rate of growth of coral reefs, or erosion of rocks, or on the former extension of glaciers over portions of Europe and America, are equally worthless. As an illustration of the utter insufficiency of any of the various methods employed by men of science in evaluating geologic time, and of the widely-different results to which such methods may give rise, we shall instance the chronometer to which geologists most frequently appeal, and which is regarded by the majority of them as the most reliable time-measurer which they, thus far, have at their disposal.

The chronometer in question is the well-known gorge between Niagara Falls and Queenstown. Assuming that the entire gorge from Lake Ontario to Niagara has been eroded by the gradually receding cataract; and assuming further, as all glacialists do, that the birth of the Falls dates from the retrogression of the great ice-sheet that enveloped this portion of territory during the Glacial Period, the problem is to determine the amount of time that has been required for the formation of this gorge, and to estimate the number of years that have elapsed since the close of the Ice Age at this point.

It is perfectly manifest that, if we could ascertain the rate of recession of the Falls, that the problem would become a very simple one indeed. All that would then be necessary would be to divide the length of the gorge—about seven miles—by the rate of recession per annum.

But two grave difficulties present themselves. It is not, in the first place, certain that the entire gorge is the result of post-Glacial action. On the contrary, there are many able glacialists who contend that a portion of the ravine was eroded before the Glacial

¹ "Gravel Man and Palæolithic Culture," etc., in *Science* for January 20, 1893.

² *Dictionnaire Apologetique, Art. Chronometres Naturels.*

Period, and that we have, as yet, no means of knowing just how much of the work has been done since the torrent of Niagara began to pour over its escarpment at Queenstown. In the second place, in spite of the numerous attempts to determine the rate of recession of the Falls, the most conflicting results have been reached, and that, too, by those who, we should think, were most competent to grapple with the problem.

According to the distinguished Swiss geologist, Desor, the rate of recession of the Falls is not more than one foot in a century. This would carry back the date when this grand chronometer was first set agoing full 3,500,000 years. Sir Charles Lyell estimated the maximum rate of erosion to be one foot per annum, and fixed the beginning of the cataract at 35,000 years ago. The English geologist, Bakewell, together with other careful observers, calculated the rate of retrogression to be two or three feet a year. Mr. C. K. Gilbert, of the United States Geological Survey, and Mr. R. S. Woodward, of Washington, as the result of very careful measurements, determined the average rate of recession to be five feet per annum. Hence, Mr. Gilbert, who is universally recognized as one of the most careful and reliable of observers, and one of the most eminent authorities in such matters, does not hesitate to declare that the "maximum length of time since the birth of the Falls, by the separation of the lakes, is only seven thousand years, and that even this small measure may need significant reduction."

An evidence of the truth of the conclusions arrived at by Gilbert and Woodward, is the remarkable manner in which they agree with the results obtained by other observers by the employment, sometimes of similar, and sometimes of different, methods of computation.

If the beginning of Niagara Falls marks, as has been assumed, the disappearance of the great ice-sheet at this point, it is but natural to infer that observations made at other cataracts in the same or nearly the same latitude would indicate, at least approximately, the same date for the close of the Glacial Period. Thus, according to Professor Winchell, the average rate of recession of the Falls of St. Anthony, since they first started at Fort Snelling, a little over eight miles below the present cataract, has been a trifle more than five and a half feet per year. This would fix the date of the birth of the falls at Fort Snelling at 7803 years. A detailed study of divers minor waterfalls and gorges in Ohio, by Professor Wright, fully sustains the calculations regarding the falls of St. Anthony and Niagara. From observations which he made, concerning the average rate at which the waters of Lake Michigan are eroding its banks and washing the sediment into deeper water,

Dr. E. Andrews, of Chicago, concludes that the lakes which date from the Glacial Period cannot have been in existence more than 7500 years. Calculations based on lakes and kettle-holes in New England and the northwest all lead to identical conclusions.

It seems, therefore, demonstrably certain that the age of the chronometers just referred to is much less than certain even eminent geologists have imagined. We hence infer, that the Ice Age, far from having the antiquity so often attributed to it, is of quite recent date. The same must then be said of man whose advent was probably synchronous with the latter portion of the reign of ice. It is, consequently, impossible for the gorges, lake-basins, and kettle-holes which we have been considering, to "have existed for the indefinite periods sometimes said to have elapsed since the glacial era, while eternity itself is scarcely long enough for the development of species, if the rate of change is no greater than is implied if man and his companions, both of the animal and vegetable kingdoms, were substantially what they now as long ago as the date often assigned to the great Ice Age."¹

It is because it has fancied that it has unlimited time at its disposal, that it has almost "eternity itself" to draw on, that the evolutionary school "under the influence of Darwinian prejudices" has handled time with such a strange laxity, and has talked of the millions of years that must be attributed to even the shortest of the geologic periods.

According to the uniformitarian school of geologists, the origin of life upon the earth must be referred back full 500,000,000 years. As the result of certain calculations regarding the rate of erosion of the earth's surface, and of the deposition of sedimentary rocks, the Rev. H. N. Hutchinson thinks that no less than 600,000,000 years have been required for the formation of the known stratified rocks of the earth's crust.² To accomplish this same work, Sir Archibald Geike requires a period lasting somewhere between 73,000,000 and 680,000,000 of years.³ Mr. W. J. McGee, reasoning from the same premises, demands seven billions of years for this portion of the earth's duration, and twice this amount of time since for the period that has elapsed since it began its existence as a planet.⁴ In the first edition of his "Origin of Species," Darwin claimed 306,652,400 years for "the denudation of the world," which he informed us was "a mere trifle" in comparison with that which was requisite for the establishing of his theory. These are large figures, it is true, but they are still small beside the many "milliards of thousands of years," which Hæckel assures us have

¹ Wright's *Great Ice Age in North America*, chap.xx.

² *Knowledge*, September, 1893.

³ *Nature*, August 4, 1892.

⁴ *American Anthropologist*, October, 1892.

elapsed since man's original ancestor—the primal, self-created moneron—appeared on this globe of ours.

Unfortunately, however, for geologists and biologists who worship at the altar of Chronos, mathematicians and physicists and astronomers have interposed a strong demurrer against the assumption of such countless æons, and have shown cause why their demurrer should stand.

According to computations made long ago by Sir William Thomson, now Lord Kelvin, and based on a study of the earth's internal heat and its rate of radiation into space, the whole of geologic time must be limited within a period of 100,000,000 years. Proceeding from similar data, Professor Tait affirms that if the earth existed at all 100,000,000 years ago, it was in a fluid condition and at a white heat, and concludes that it is impossible to allow geologists "more scope for their speculations than about ten, or say, at most, 15,000,000 of years."¹

The distinguished French astronomer, Faye, in his profound work "*Sur l'Origine du Monde*,"² and Prof. S. Newcomb, hold substantially the same views. The latter says in reference to this subject, "If we reflect that a diminution of the solar-heat by less than one-fourth its amount would probably make our earth so cold that all the water on its surface would freeze, while an increase by much more than one-half would probably boil the water all away, it must be admitted that the balance of causes which would result in the sun radiating heat just fast enough to preserve the earth in its present state has probably not existed more than 10,000,000 years."³

Mr. George H. Darwin, Professor of Mathematics in Cambridge University, by computing the influence of tidal friction in retarding the rotation of the earth, arrives at the conclusion that 57,000,000 years ago the length of the day was less than seven hours, that the moon was only one-seventh of its present distance from the earth, whilst the time of a lunar revolution was but a trifle more than a day and a half. Such a condition of things as Ball has pointed out would suppose, if there were then any water on the earth's surface, the existence of tides 600 feet high, sweeping around the world every four hours and utterly destructive of every form of animal or vegetable life.

From a long series of careful experiments on the rock diabase in its relations to heat and pressure, Clarence King of the United States Geological Survey, computes the entire age of the earth, from the beginning of its planetary existence to be not more than

¹ *Recent Advances on Physical Science.*

² Chap. xiv.

³ *Popular Astronomy*, p. 511.

24,000,000 years.¹ Accepting as true Lord Kelvin's conclusions regarding the age of the sun, as given in a recent lecture at the Royal Institution of Great Britain some years ago, Sir J. W. Dawson reduces "the whole of geological time, since the formation of the oldest Laurentian rocks," to about 6,000,000 of years, or possibly less,² and concludes that the facts both of geology and astronomy beautifully "harmonize in point of time with those of the Bible history."

Another great source of error has been the disposition of geologists to build theories on trifles, and to draw conclusions from facts but partially or imperfectly observed. Thus from a few flint flakes discovered in France and Portugal, M. de Mortillet does not hesitate to deduce an argument for the existence of Tertiary man, or for that of some intelligent being who was man's predecessor, to whom he assigns an antiquity of more than a quarter of a million of years. On more careful examination, however, these flints are proven by the most eminent authorities, Virchow and Evans, among others, to have been produced by the operation of natural causes—by solar heat, or accidental percussion, for instance,—and to afford no evidence whatever of the action of man, or other intelligent being. The flint flakes, bulbs or conchoids of percussion, as they are sometimes called, on which M. de Mortillet bases his fanciful hypotheses, are numbered by hundreds of thousands. If he could demonstrate that they were fashioned by human hands, and were not the product of natural forces, he would, considering the number of specimens at his disposal, have a very strong argument indeed. This he is unable to do. There are others again who are prepared to make a profession of faith regarding the existence of Tertiary man on much slighter evidence. Two flint flakes, such as we have instanced, are offered by Boyd Dawkins as evidence of the existence of Tertiary Man in England. *Credat Apelles Judæus*. A few years ago a bone was found in one of the English caves under glacial clay, and pronounced by some of the best known scientists of the day to be a human fibula, and to be therefore, a certain indication of the existence of man in pre-Glacial times. The bone was subsequently submitted to a careful examination by experts, and pronounced to be that of a *bear*, or in the learned phraseology of the committee it was declared to be "ursine" rather than "human," while others equally competent to diagnose the case came to the conclusion that it might be almost any bone. In like manner certain notched, or incised bones have been adduced as evidence of the existence of Miocene

¹ *The American Journal of Science*, January, 1893.

² *Modern Science in Bible Lands*, p. 175.

Man. The incisions, it was argued, were such as could be made only by instruments of human manufacture. It is now known that similar cuts are made on bones that have been gnawed by the porcupine and other animals. And yet more. Sundry sharpened sticks found in certain inter-Glacial deposits are appealed to as the handiwork of man, and as conclusive evidence of the great antiquity of the human race. But scarcely is this ingenious theory advanced when it is shown that similar sharpened sticks can be and have been fashioned by beavers.¹ From a number of rudely flaked stones found in the gravel beds of Trenton, Dr. C. C. Abbott, builds up an ingenious theory regarding the existence of a race of men of peculiar culture in the Delaware valley in Glacial times, 10,000 or more years ago. Mr. Holmes makes a critical investigation of these deposits and flaked stones under exceptionally favorable circumstances, and comes to the conclusion, which we heartily endorse, that "the phenomena observed may all be accounted for as a result of the vicissitudes of aboriginal life and occupation within the last few hundred years as fully and as satisfactorily as by jumping thousands of years backward into the unknown."²

Truly while examining some of the evidence presented by geologists in favor of the antiquity of man one cannot help saying with Goethe, "The thing the most terrible to hear is the constantly reiterated assurance that geologists agree on a given point." For one who knows men, it is easy to divine what this means. Persons of vivid and bold imaginations take possession of an idea and give it all the appearance of probability. They soon have followers and disciples, and when these are somewhat numerous they are always looked upon as possessing special authority in science. Hundreds of educated men, occupied with other duties, are satisfied to leave to these adventurous explorers their chosen domain, and to give their approbation to all that does not affect them individually. This is what is called the unanimous consent of the learned.³

How applicable to the fantasies and idle babble, the seethings of brain and the vibrations of nerve of some of our modern scientists are the following lines of a recent writer :

"Oh the thoughts, the revelations of our age that lie enshrined in the caldron of
man's mind;
How they seethe, how they simmer, how they swim and how they swirl,
How they wriggle, how they wrestle, how they whisk and how they whrl!"

¹ *Epoch of the Mammoth*, pp. 407, 408.

² "Glacial Man in the Trenton Gravels," in the *Journal of Geology*, vol. i., 1893, p. 32.

³ Baumner's *Kreuzzeugen*, i., p. 70. "Goethe als Naturforscher."

In 1857 was discovered near Düsseldorf the famous Neanderthal skull that occasioned such a flutter of excitement in the scientific world. Prof. Schaaffhausen adjudged it to be "the most ancient memorial of the early inhabitants of Europe." Prof. Fuhbrott wrote a book on it in which he declared the age of the relic to be from two hundred to three hundred thousand years. But this estimate was soon proven to be as extravagant as it was unwarranted. Dr. Mayer, of Bonn, as the result of a critical examination of the "fossil" and the locality in which it was found came to the conclusion that it was the skull of a Cossack killed in 1814!

JOHN A. ZAHM, C.S.C.

THE CHURCH IN HER HISTORY.

IN considering the Catholic Church our thoughts revert to those mountains of Moab which rear themselves like a rampart beyond the river Jordan, and over which we have watched the sun rise slowly, and solemnly, and majestically, suggesting the idea of irresistible power and an almighty impulsive force of celestial mechanism. It is there beyond, in the land of the Midianites, that the poet and the prophet, bribed to curse but impelled to bless, poured out his words at sight of the people of God, arranged in exact and beautiful order in their camps—already an immense multitude: "How beautiful are thy tabernacles, O Jacob, and thy tents, O Israel! As woody valleys, as watered gardens near the rivers, as tabernacles which the Lord hath pitched, as cedars by the water-side."¹

These are the most harmonious verses in our English Bible. We may apply them to the Church, which is the body of Christians united in the same faith, in the same sacraments, and in obedience to the same pastors, but especially the Roman pontiff. The Church is always one, always visible, always infallible in faith and morals, being the pillar and ground of the truth. The Church is the house of the Living God, the city of the Great King, the kingdom of Christ spread far and wide, and teaching all nations; she is the fold of which Christ is the shepherd, the body of which Christ is

¹ Numb., xxiv., 5-6.

the head, the spouse of whom Christ is the bridegroom ; she is ever subject to Him and ever faithful to Him ; she is ever beloved of Him, and ever cherished by Him. The Church and Christ are joined to one another by an everlasting union. Whosoever shall gather together against her shall fall, and the nation that will not serve her shall perish. These are the chief characteristics of that divine institution which is the Holy Roman Catholic and Apostolic Church. She is on this earth, but not from this earth ; she is in this world, but not of this world. Like a city set upon a mountain, all can look to her ; like a light shining in a high place, all may see her. Such things have never been told of any other institution among men : “Glorious things are said of thee, O City of God.”¹ How wonderful, therefore, the Church is. How venerable, how enduring, how strong she is. How instructive and how interesting is her history. To no other history do the words of the Roman orator so well apply, who calls History “the witness of times past, the lamp of truth, the soul of memory, the messenger of antiquity, the teacher of life.” *Historia vero testis temporum, lux veritatis, vita memoriæ, magistra vitæ, nuntia vetustatis.*² Hence the learned Melchior Canus says a theologian is not worthy of the name if he is not acquainted with ecclesiastical history.³ The history of the Church seems to us, at this point of time, to have been divided into four grand epochs. These are from her establishment to the conversion of Constantine, first Christian emperor ; from the conversion of Constantine to the crowning of Charlemagne ; from the crowning of Charlemagne to the Protestant Reformation ; from the Protestant Reformation to the great French Revolution and this present period.

Saint Paul, addressing the clergy of Ephesus, speaks of the Church of God as that “which He hath purchased with His own blood.”⁴ Hence, to understand the general trend of this most extraordinary history we must figure to ourselves the closest analogy between the Church, which is the bride, and Christ, who is the bridegroom. Their lives and vicissitudes are similar : and as the life of our Lord on earth, from the stable of Bethlehem to the cross on Calvary, was one of sorrow, persecution and suffering, so, also, the state of His Church on earth, which is necessarily in opposition to the world—for, as the Apostle James writes, “Whosoever will be a friend of this world becometh an enemy to God,”⁵—must be one of perpetual warfare. At first the Church was attacked by paganism—this she overthrew ; next by heretics—these she conquered ; then by the barbarians—them she converted ;

¹ Ps., 86, 3.² Cic., *De Oratore*, l. ii., c. ix.³ *De Locis*, lib., xi., c. 2.⁴ Acts, xx., 28.⁵ Jas., iv., 4.

finally, after a period of peace and triumph, such as came to our blessed Lord when they would take and make him king, and when they hailed his solemn entry into Jerusalem, by the great revolt, commonly called the Reformation, which contained, openly or in germ, every error, every schism, and every heresy of every period that went before. The history of the Catholic Church joins together two ages of human civilization. It is the connecting link between the ancient and the modern world. Rome was then the capital of the Pagan world and Rome is now the head of the Christian world.

In the first period of the Church's history there were ten general persecutions directed against her throughout the length and breadth of the vast Roman empire. Besides these there were continual partial persecutions in different parts of the empire, due to sudden ebullition of the masses, to caprice, cruelty, or avarice of governors and local magistrates, and to the "unjust disputations of the juris-consults." Hence, the well-known sarcastic passage in Tertullian: "If the Tiber overflow its banks; if there be a famine or a plague; if there be a cold, a dry, or a scorching season; if any public calamity overtake us, the universal cry of the populace is, 'to the lion with the Christians'—*Christiani ad leonem*." Although Livy says that no people were fonder of moderation in punishment than the Romans, which was true during the republic, yet, under the empire, public executions became frequent, and many new and cruel torments were introduced. The constant persecution of the Christians increased the appetite of the people for horrors, and did more than anything else, perhaps, to undermine the old fabric of chartered liberties, and reduce the world, under the tyranny of the emperor, whose will became law, and gave rise to that maxim which embodies the gravest of all offences against the rights and dignity of man: *Quod placuit principi, id legis vigorem habet*.¹ Christianity was first made permanently criminal by a decree of the emperor Nero, A.D. 64, confirmed by an obsequious and degraded senate. Its professors were by the very fact held to be enemies of the human race, and guilty of the most heinous crime that one could commit—the crime of *læsæ majestatis*, or, as we would now say, high treason. Their sentence was death by the sword, by beasts, by crosses, by flames, by scourging and by unusual punishments contrived on purpose. The *senatus-consultum* against the Christians remained unrepealed for three hundred years, although it was sometimes suspended or otherwise tempered, according to the humor of the reigning prince. Thus, all students of Church history are acquainted with the famous but

¹ See Mackenzie: *Studies in Roman Law*.

inconsistent answer of Trajan to Pliny, then governor of Bithynia, who had consulted him as to how he should proceed against the Christians. This emperor, about whom mediæval legend seems to have woven such a singular web of mythical virtue, answered his friend that, although Christianity was still a capital crime, persons supposed to be Christians are not to be sought for, anonymous accusations against them are not to be entertained; but if they are accused openly, and the charge is proven, they are to be punished. All who apostatized are to be forgiven. It may be curious in connection with this emperor, under whom the persecution was more general, and more blood was shed than under either Nero or Domitian, among the victims being Saint Simeon, of Jerusalem, Saint Ignatius, of Antioch, and Saint Domitilla, virgin, niece of the celebrated Flavius Clemens, to refer to that most singular and preposterous story which so stirred the ire of Melchior Canus, about Saint Gregory having liberated his soul out of hell. Dante is responsible for giving it new life:

“There the high glory of the Roman prince
Was chronicled, whose great beneficence
Moved Gregory to his great victory;
'Tis of the Emperor Trajan I am speaking;
And a poor widow at his bridle stood,
In attitude of weeping and of grief.”¹—*Purg.*, x, 73.

During the last and fiercest of the general persecutions, which was that of Diocletian, arches were erected and medals struck in the emperor's honor, because, as their inscriptions boasted, he had abolished the very name of Christian—*Ob nomen Christianum deletum*. We are reminded of what some people thought of the visible Headship of the Church three centuries ago, as in the last words of Tennyson's *Queen Mary*:

Lords.—God save Elizabeth, the Queen of England!
Bagenhall.—God save the Crown! the Papacy is no more.
Paget (aside).—Are we so sure of that?

It has been calculated that at least five million Christians were put to death for the faith during the first three hundred years of the Church's existence. But her followers increased in numbers after every persecution; and the great truth spoken by one of her Apologists was always exemplified: That the blood of Martyrs is the seed of Christians. We stand awe-struck at the wonderful ways of Providence, when we see in the Eternal City that the only monument bearing Diocletian's name—the stupendous ruins of his baths, in the erection of which forty thousand Christians, con-

¹ See Hettinger: *Dante's Divina Commedia: Its Scope and Value*, p. 212.

demned to the public works, were engaged, often cutting quickly, rudely, crosses, monograms and other Christian symbols in the warm mortar and on the bricks as they were handled—is now a Christian church and the title of a cardinal, and makes true the words of the heathen author, who, in a sense that he little imagined, described these baths, in their magnificence and pride, as *Thermæ Diocletiani tam æterni quam sacrati nominis*.¹ Again, we see still standing at Rome, one of the most imposing and most completely preserved of all ancient Roman monuments—the triumphal arch, erected within ten years of Diocletian's death, on which the senate and people of Rome proclaim in a long and laudatory inscription that Constantine had conquered “By inspiration of the Divinity.” It was the exaltation of the Holy Cross and the triumph of the Church. As doubts have been thrown on the genuineness of parts of this important inscription, whether, namely, the remarkable words, *quod instinctu divinitatis*, form part of the original, or are of later date, taking the place of some common heathen expression, such as *Diis Faventibus* or *Nutu. Jovis. Opt. Max.*, which had been erased, Protestants, like the German Burckhardt, being ready to make a point against Constantine upon this supposition, and historians of the cynical school, like the Frenchman Ampère,² always toning down whatever might tell in favor of Christianity, it may be of interest to examine the matter a little at length. The name of Constantine, revered by subsequent ages as that of the first Christian emperor, seems to have defended his triumphal arch from the barbarous spoliation which other monuments of ancient Rome have suffered. It was called in the Middle Ages “The Arch of Piety.” It spans the ancient *Via Triumphalis*, and was erected, inscribed and dedicated in the year 315, after the emperor's victory over Maxentius, with all its preceding circumstances of the apparition of the Cross in the heavens, and the introduction of the Labarum as the imperial standard, and the substitution of the monogram of Christ upon the Roman ensigns.

We give the entire inscription, which is one of the earliest documents, so to say, of Church history :

Imp. caes. Fl. Constantino. Maximo.
 P. F. Augusto. S. P. Q. R.
 Quod, Instinctu. Divinitatis. Mentis.
 Magnitudine. Cum. Exercitu. Suo.
 Tam. De. Tyranno. Quam. De. Omni. Ejus.
 Factione. Uno. Tempore. Justis.
 Rempubicam. Ultus. Est. Armis.
 Arcum. Triumphis. Insignem. Dicavit.

¹ Piazza: *Le Sacre Stazioni Romane*, p. 236.

² Il paraît même que ces mots on été ajoutés après coup pour remplacer une form-

Of this we propose as a free translation :

The Senate and People of Rome
Have dedicated a Triumphal Arch
To the Emperor Cæsar Flavius Constantine Augustus
Pious, Happy, Great.
For that by Inspiration of the Divinity
Confident in his own Pre-eminence
Engaging with his Army in a just war
He at one blow avenged the State
Upon the Tyrant and all his Faction.

Our friend, the greatest living archæologist, Commendatore J. B. de Rossi, was so kind as to admit us to participate in the special examination and studies which he made of this inscription thirty years ago, and which were published in the *Bullettino di Archeologia Cristiana*, 1863, numbers 7, 8, and 11. He there proves, in a manner which has carried conviction to every critic, that no alteration has been made, or, indeed, was easily possible, since the words are cut upon the actual enormous blocks of the structure, five of which would have had to be removed in order to effect the change suggested by the opponents of an expression so Christian as that which we have been discussing.

Over the grand reliefs in the interior of the arch we read on one side the words, *Fundatori Quietis*, and on the other the words *Liberatori Urbis*: The Restorer of Peace: The Deliverer of the Capital. The former words seem clearly to allude to the cessation of the Christian persecutions. The conversion of Constantine was followed by a full edict of toleration, known as the famous *Edict of Milan*, whereby the rescripts of past emperors were revoked and abolished, and legal sanction given to Christian worship. This closes the first great epoch in the Church's history. Peace had now dawned, but it was not to last long. *There must be heresies*, writes St. Paul to the Corinthians,¹ not, indeed, by God's will, but by reason of the pride of man's intellect and the perversity of his heart. Hitherto the Church's enemies had been from without, but now were come the "perils from false brethren," as the Apostle warns. Everything that the Church taught was attacked in turn by theologians, philosophers, men of science, statesmen, princes, potentates and emperors. All the great heresies were relative to the doctrine of Incarnation. Arius, who denied the divinity of Christ, was the life and soul of this hydra-headed monster of Arianism, from which was distilled the venom of so many other heresies. Appeal

ule peut-être plus explicitement païenne. Ce monument, qui célèbre le triomphe de Constantin, ne proclame donc pas encore nettement le triomphe du Christianisme."—*L'Empire Romain à Rome*, ii., p. 355.

¹ I., xi., 19.

was always made to the Roman pontiff, although obedience was not always given to his decision. He judged in last resort all religious controversies. His convocation or consent, and final approbation, were necessary to render a council œcumenical. Peter, to whom was made the divine promise by Jesus Christ that His Church should be founded upon him as upon the rock which his name expressed, and against which the gates of hell should not prevail, was ever living in his successors, and Peter spoke in every dogmatic act and utterance of the Roman pontiffs. Athanasius, surnamed the Great, was the sword of Orthodoxy in the Arian struggle. He was the hero of the age, and the champion providentially raised up to defend, by his voice, his pen and his example, the divinity of our Lord. Ever in union with the far-distant Pope, this patriarch of the East, although abandoned by those he trusted most, and hunted by those who thirsted for his blood, never wavered, never compromised, never yielded, but stood like a beacon-tower amidst the angry seas. It was Athanasius against the world: "A dauntless soul erect, who smiled on death." These storms, too, passed off; but soon other clouds, full of menace, and big with coming disaster, appeared in masses on the horizon. Countless hordes of barbarians forced their way, in successive invasions, into every part of the Roman and Christian empire. Like a dreadful inundation the waters rose higher and higher, sweeping away and burying the language, the institutions, the monuments, the civilization of a thousand years, until the fairest part of the world was a desert. It is impossible for human pen to faithfully record the sorrows, the afflictions, the sufferings, the anguish, the losses, the desolation of the Christian people during these centuries of barbaric invasion: *Crudelis ubique*

Luctus, ubique pavor, et plurima mortis imago.

The words of the English laureate, in "Idylls of the King," describing the miserable state of Britain after the withdrawal of the Roman legions, are applicable to every country that had once been part and province of the empire :

"For many a petty king ere Arthur came
 Ruled in this isle, and ever waging war
 Each upon other, wasted all the land ;
 And still from time to time the heathen host
 Swarm'd over seas, and harried what was left
 And so there grew great tracts of wilderness,
 Wherein the beast was ever more and more,
 But man was less and less till Arthur came."

The real Arthur, indeed, was Charlemagne, and his paladins were the captains fighting in a wider field than that of any provincial

king and knights of the Round-table. Only one thing now remained intact, although cruelly hurt by iron, fire, and flood. This was the Church, which, like the "Great Pyramid, stood unshaken amidst the ruins of a world which had passed away,"¹ The Church sent forth her bishops, her priests, her monks as missionaries. Armed only with the crucifix and the Word of God, they went out in every direction conquering and to conquer. Huns and Goths, Vandals, Visigoths and Burgundians, Lombards, Saxons, Danes and Normans, all in turn were brought to the bosom of Holy Mother Church. Never was a conquest so peaceful and so complete; never a more signal triumph of mind over matter; never a sublimer illustration of the Apostle's words to the Corinthians: "The weak things of this world hath God chosen, that He may confound the strong."² No wonder that the Christian poet Prosper, of Aquitaine, tells exultingly, in exquisite Latin verse, that Rome as the seat of Peter and the capital of the world, holds in subjection, through the influence of Truth, more nations than were ever subdued by force of arms:

*Roma sedes Petri, quæ pastoralis honoris
Facta caput mundo, quidquid non possidet armis
Religione tenet.*

In this regeneration of the world the chief share was, of course, the work of Christian bishops, but their faithful assistants were the priests and monks. These were the instruments of the Church; and we could not better summarize the wonderful and successful mission of the Church at this period than by quoting from the author of "The Beginning of the Middle Ages:"³ "Amid the ruins of the greatest pride and the greatest strength that the world had known, the Church alone stood erect and strong. In days when men relied only on force and violence, yet only to discover, time after time, that force alone could not give and secure power, the Church ruled by the word of persuasion, by example, by knowledge, by its higher view of life, by its obstinate hopes and visible beneficence, by its confidence in innocence, by its call to peace. The Church had faith in itself and its mission where all other faith had broken down. It might be afflicted and troubled by the disasters of the time, but its work was never arrested by them, nor its courage abated. It still offered shelter and relief among the confusion, even after war had broken into its sanctuaries, and the sword had slaughtered its ministers; it still persisted in holding out the light from heaven, when the air was filled with storm and darkness." This epoch closed with the crowning of Charlemagne and the restoration of the Western Empire.

¹ Macaulay.

² I. Cor., i., 27.

³ P. 48, A.D., 400-800.

Nothing can be conceived more touching or more beautiful than that ceremony of the crowning of Charlemagne at Midnight Mass, on Christmas, A.D. 800, by Pope Leo III., the ninety-eighth successor of him who had entered Rome barefooted and alone, in the year 42, in the reign of the Emperor Claudius, and who had been put to an ignominious death, in the year 67, in the reign of the Emperor Nero. O, how things were changed since then. The sceptre of dominion had been wrested from the feeble hands of Romulus Augustulus, the last direct successor of Augustus. Pitiless barbarians had beaten the Imperial City to the ground. She lay helpless amidst her Seven Hills, ravaged of her children, the Niope of nations, in unutterable woe and voiceless desolation. But the end was not yet:

“Hope was ever on her mountain, watching till the day begun
Crown’d with sunlight—over darkness—from the still unrisen sun.”

Christ, the Consoler, came and kissed that holy brow. The spell was broken. He took her by the hand and raised her from her trance and gave her new life, and confirmed her ancient and inalienable rights of Mother and Mistress of the World in a higher and a nobler sense than ever kings or consuls, or emperors, or bards, or poets, or historians had dreamed of in their maddest ecstasy of *Urbs Æternals*. The smoke of heathen sacrifices had been succeeded by the fragrance of Christian incense offered to the Clean Oblation of a New and Everlasting Testament. The Forum, which had resounded with the eloquence of Tully, was now silent. The Sacred and Victorious Way—*Via Sacra, Clivus Victoriæ*—over which had marched the shouting legions of Augustus was disused and broken up. The stupendous palace, from whose verdant terraces and gilded porticos and balconies and windows thousands had applauded the darling triumph of Germanicus, was all in ruins. The visible images of Rome’s earthly grandeur were gone; but there still remained the mightier influence and power of religion. And Rome was now to exercise the strongest act of authority that the world had ever seen. The long dormant Western Empire was to be revived, and at its head was to be placed a prince of that barbaric race which had destroyed the original work of Cæsar Augustus and captured and slain his successors. The place was not unworthy of the occasion. It was that glorious Constantinian basilica which had already stood for five hundred years, and whose deep foundations, hallowed in soil brought from Jerusalem, surrounded a spot called the Confession, where first had rested and now reposed the body of Saint Peter. His shrine was rich with precious stones. A hundred lamps of gold, fed with the purest olive oil, shed a dim religious light around. His altar blazed with polished marbles

and jewelled chalices and crucifixes. The pavement of this grand edifice was laid with rare and many-colored stones; the walls were decorated with superb mosaics; the aisles were divided by rows of fluted columns with corinthian capitals—the willing spoil of ancient temples; the ceiling was of cedar of Lebanon, skillfully carved and gilded. Around the Pope were ranged, in gorgeous vestments, the cardinals, bishops, and prelates of his court, and in brilliant military and civil costumes the still recognized descendants of senators, patricians, knights and consuls. Before him knelt the Frankish ruler—the one only prince in all the world in whose favor the title of Great has been indissolubly blended with the name. With one hand on his sword and the other touching the open Book of the Gospels, he swore to maintain the cause of God and the rights and privileges of Holy Church. Then was placed upon his head by the hands of the Pope a golden crown surmounted by a globe and cross, to symbolize this perfect truth that “The lion of the house of Juda hath prevailed:” Christ conquers! Christ reigns! Christ governs! Thus was set the seal of papal consecration to a government founded on revealed religion. Then was pronounced in solemn chaunt, begun by the choir, and taken up by the Pope, the clergy, the Roman nobles and people, and the chiefs and great men of the Franks, this novel acclamation: “To Charles—Pious—Augustus—Crowned of God—Great—Peace-giving Emperor—Life and Victory.” This was thrice repeated, each time in a louder key. It was also loudly proclaimed that this was done “at Rome, the mother of sovereignty”; and all the successors of Charlemagne¹ in the Holy Roman and Germanic empire, which lasted over a thousand years, were bound to come to Rome to be crowned by the Pope. Thus, also, the Church put an end forever to such disquiet and agitation as, Tacitus tells us, filled all classes in the old empire after the death of

¹ Charlemagne is assuredly the greatest layman in the Church's history—one who brought to perfection what Constantine only began; and it may be interesting to note that, dying on the 28th of January, 814, he was buried in our Lady's Church of Aix-la-Chapelle. His sepulchre was opened three hundred years after his death by the emperor Frederick Barbarossa, who descended after dark with fear and trembling and awful sentiments, into the dread presence of him who still appeared to hold imperial sway. Although dead, he seemed alive. His body had been carefully embalmed. He was seated erect on a solid throne of gold; his sacred emblem was on his head; a thin, transparent veil fell over his face; a purple mantle, clasped with precious stones, was gathered around him; his sword, “Joyeuse,” which he had borne on so many battle fields for God and Holy Church, was hung beside him; his right hand held the golden sceptre which he had received from Leo, while his left rested on the open page of an illuminated copy of the Gospels. Thus, even in death, he was linked with the triumphs of religion. A wonderfully graphic representation of the scene has been painted in fresco by Albert Bethel, in 1870, and is a *chef d'œuvre* of the German school.

Nero, when the distant legionaries saluted Galba: *evulgato imperii arcano, posse principem alibi quam Romæ fieri.*¹

A majestic era now opened to the Church. All the grand and beneficent institutions of modern times have their beginning in these Middle Ages—these ages of Faith. Now were established those many religious Orders in which piety and learning walked hand in hand; now were founded those great Universities that still endure; now were built those heavenly Cathedrals which we cannot equal with all our science and all our wealth; now were gathered up the literary remains of classical antiquity, and carefully copied and preserved in monastic and collegiate libraries in expectation of the Art preservative of all arts—the invention of printing—which should endow them with a species of immortality; now were composed the sublimest anthems, hymns and canticles in which song and music have become the handmaids of religion, and the human soul moved to its inmost depths—such as the *Pange Lingua*, the *Stabat Mater*, the *Lauda Sion*, the *Dies Iræ*, the *Veni Creator Spiritus*. Let us mention, also, the Truce of God, by which bloodshed and war were minimized; the saving clause of Benefit of Clergy, by which a premium was put on learning; and, finally, those missionary expeditions, those extended travels, those adventurous navigations, those geographical studies which found the ocean-route to India and led to the wonderful discovery of America. At the beginning of the sixteenth century everything opened brightly for a long and glorious cycle of prosperity. But, alas! the calm was soon disturbed by ominous sounds; the voice of one crying in the North, “I will not serve.”² Martin Luther had appealed to Rome. Rome had spoken and decided against him; the case was closed. The priest would not submit, and with him began that era called Protestant, because it protested against the dogmas and traditions of the old Church, the ancient Church, the early Church, the primitive Church, the Apostolic Church. A witty controversialist once said in answer to the boastful assertion that Protestantism gave liberty to reason, that rather it gave liberty to the flesh. In fact, we could not help thinking of this and of Esdras: *multi . . . peccaverunt propter mulieres*, and of Saint Justin Martyr, reproving the Greeks in the same sense: “In the ‘Iliad’ and the ‘Odyssee’—woman! always woman! from the beginning to the end.” One day when visiting the British Museum, there, in the Manuscript Department, the very first of the series of remarkable original letters shown under glass cases, we saw that famous one of Desiderius Erasmus, of Rotterdam, dated from Basel on the 24th of December, 1525, and addressed to Nicholas

¹ Hist., i., 4.

² Jer., ii, 20.

Everard, president of Holland, in which he says of Luther's marriage to the ex-nun, Catharine Bora: *Solent comici tumultus ferè in matrimonium exire. . . . Similem exitum habitura videtur Lutherana tragædia. Duxit uxorem monachus monacham.*—The Reformation, like all comedies, ends in marriage. We remember being struck, on our first visit to the Vatican Library, by the exquisite irony of that isolated glass-covered stand on which was a scarlet cushion, and on the cushion were two things: the original copy of Henry VIII.'s treatise against Luther, sent to Pope Leo X. in 1521, with the autograph dedication:

*Anglorum rex Henricus, Leo decime, mittit
Hoc opus et fidei testem et amicitie;*

and beside it an open, adulterous letter from Anne Boleyn to the king, subscribed: "*Votre loiale et plus assuré serviteur. Autre ne chere.*" Then was set up that principle of private judgment so utterly subversive of scriptural interpretation, of dogmatic teaching, and of religious unity. Its logical outcome was anarchy and the great French Revolution one hundred years ago. The war goes bravely on. The Church is ready for every foe. She will subdue this latest enemy by insisting on these cardinal points, religious education and submission to lawful authority. How often have we not heard the cry, "Her long domination is at an end." But the end is not yet, nor ever will be until the Church militant on earth is transformed and sublimated into the Church triumphant in heaven. If our thoughts are pure and holy and heroic; if our lives are filled with noble deeds and spiritual aspirations, and a sense of solemn sacrifice, we shall look forward to the Church's history in the coming ages with the confidence and joy of certain victory. The future belongs to her. We, her children, are the Argonauts; we have won the golden fleece. Peace, such as this world gives, we do not expect. Christians will still have to conquer—as in the past—by dying for human liberty; for the noblest expression of human liberty is freedom of conscience, the essence of which is that questions of the soul are beyond the jurisdiction of any civil ruler. The whole history of the Catholic Church has been a struggle to enforce this precept of the Lord: "Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's."² If the Church had not a divine origin; if the Church were merely a human institution, she must long ago have perished. There is a sustaining divinity within her, and, after every affliction,

¹ For an interesting account of the compliment bestowed on Henry for his orthodoxy before he fell, see Bridgett: "The Defender of the Faith: the Royal Title: Its History and Value."

² Luke, xx., 25.

her youth is renewed, like the eagle's. Let us end with these lines from England's convert-poet—Dryden—which Hallam calls the most musical in the language—the opening lines of “The Hind and Panther,” in which we find the energy of Bossuet in verse :

“A milk-white hind, immortal and unchang'd,
Fed on the lawns, and in the forest rang'd ;
Without unspotted, innocent within,
She fear'd no danger, for she knew no sin :
Yet had she oft been chas'd with horns and hounds
And Scythian shafts, and many wing'd wounds
Aim'd at her heart ; was often forc'd to fly,
And doom'd to death, tho' fated not to die.”

ROBERT SETON.

HARNACK'S DOGMATIC HISTORY.

Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte, von Dr. Adolf Harnack. Ord. Professor der Kirchengeschichte in Marburg. Zweite Verbesserte und Vermehrte Auflage. Freiburg. 1888.

Outlines of the History of Dogma. By Dr. Adolf Harnack, Professor of Church History in the University of Berlin. Translated by Edwin Knox Mitchell, M.A., Professor of Græco-Roman and Eastern Church History, in the Hartford Theological Seminary. New York : Funk and Wagnall's Company, London and Toronto, 1893.

DR. HARNACK is a Lutheran Minister and Professor, who made his reputation at the University of Marburg, and has since been transferred to Berlin.

He is at the head of his school of theologians, and his lecture-room is crowded by German and foreign auditors, among whom Catholics are sometimes found. His learning is vast, and he possesses a wonderful ingenuity in manipulating the facts and documents of history, so as to subserve his theory of the Christian religion. He is reputed to be an eloquent and fascinating lecturer, but his style of writing is peculiar and clumsy, and his manner of presenting his topics is often obscure and confused, so that it is difficult to discover what his beliefs and convictions are with precision and accuracy. He is thoroughly and fundamentally anti-

Catholic, and his great work is the ablest, most complete, and most plausible existing attempt to undermine historically the foundations of the Catholic religion, and to show that it is a human substitution for the original, authentic, and divine gospel. But his criticism of primitive Christian history is also equally destructive of that which Lutherans and other Protestants of the old schools regard as orthodoxy. Catholic orthodoxy he dislikes and respects; Protestant orthodoxy he despises; and he has given expression to it in almost the only piece of bitter vituperation to be found in his history of dogma.

"The later Lutheran Church in the false standard by which it measures departures in doctrine and proclaims them heretical, threatens to become a *scrawny twin* of the Catholic Church." (Mitchell's Harnack, p. 567.)

We might class Dr. Harnack as a rationalist theologian were it not that he has no rational philosophy or theology. He recognizes, with Kant and Spencer, only *relative* knowledge. He calls himself a scientific theologian, and rejects all authority whether of the Bible or the Church. At the same time, he separates faith from science and history, and relegates it to a kind of spiritual and mystic sphere, apart from the rational, where it will not trouble him in his free speculations upon the entire domain of historical Christianity. The real, actual Christianity which is an object of historical research, like Brahmanism, Buddhism, and Mohammedanism, from this point of view, is merely one form of human development, and thus, where there is freedom from dogmatic prejudice, the historic sense, and a liberal scientific spirit, they enable one to look calmly, and somewhat impartially, at things as they are, and to represent them fairly. There is a great deal of this fair and candid presentation of historical facts in Dr. Harnack's work, which gives it a considerable value for the study of ecclesiastical history. Strange as it may seem, his testimony, taken on the whole, is strongly in favor of the Catholic side as against positive Protestantism. For, dogmatic and ecclesiastical Christianity, in its earliest historical manifestation is, according to him, Catholicism. True, he attempts to show how it arose and was developed from sources extraneous to the gospel; but he places its beginnings at a date so near the Apostolic age, that it is easy to infer that the Apostles must have been its authors.

The history of the Gnostic and Marcionite heresies is especially interesting and valuable. None better can be anywhere found, so far as our knowledge extends.

The work translated by Professor Mitchell is not the larger history, in three volumes, but a compendium of the same in one. That such a work should be translated and put in circulation by a pro-

fessor in the Hartford Seminary, is a singular and ominous fact. That seminary was founded as a stronghold of the Old School theology of New England, in opposition to New Haven. It is not from New Haven, however, but from Hartford that a book is issued which is destructive of all the foundations of the system called orthodox in the seminaries of Princeton, Hartford, and even New Haven and Andover. Dr. Harnack, in his preface, says: "In reality, however, there no longer exists any distinction between German and English theological science. The exchange is now so brisk that scientific theologians of all Evangelical lands form already one concilium."

We commend this book to the careful perusal of Mr. Mitchell's fellow-professors, and the members of the "Pastoral Union." Will they recognize Dr. Harnack and his doctrines as "Evangelical?" If so, they should at once go into fellowship with the Unitarians of Cambridge, and strike the flag of orthodoxy.

The history of dogma, in Dr. Harnack's sense, is the history of the rise and development of a system of formulated definitions of doctrine, professing to be derived from divine revelation, and decreed by authority as constitutive principles of the ecclesiastical society which declares itself to be the Christian Church.

Dr. Harnack distinguishes between the Gospel, properly so-called, and the preaching of the first evangelists, and the dogmatic Christianity which arose after the transplanting of the Christian religion from Jewish to Gentile soils under the influence of Greek philosophy, and was then developed into Catholicism. He does not profess to mark precisely the periods of transition and the earliest phases of development. But, in a general way, he takes the middle of the third century as an epoch, in which the transformation has reached a stage of growth which exhibits the specific characters and features of the new religion in distinct outlines. The chief of these are a formal confession of faith expanded from the baptismal creed, a canon of New Testament Scripture, and a hierarchical order, exercising the teaching, governing, and sacerdotal offices, in a church organically one and catholic.

"If we compare the Church in the middle of the third century with the condition of Christianity 150 to 200 years earlier, we find that there is a religious community, while earlier there were only particular congregations, which believed in such a general community and strove to give it expression with the simplest means; we find the same furnished with fixed forms of every kind, not Jewish but Græco-Roman, and we recognize, finally, in the doctrine of faith on which this community is grounded the philosophical spirit of the Greeks. We find a church as a political commonwealth and institute of worship, a formulated faith, a theology; but

find no longer the old individuality and enthusiasm which did not feel itself constricted by subjection to the authority of the Old Testament. We find, instead of independent Christians filled with the spirit, a new revealed document, the New Testament, and Christian *priests*. When did these formations begin?" (Vol. i., p. 43.)

When, indeed? Nothing can be more logically and historically certain than that they must have begun with the Apostles and with Jesus Christ. This very singular passage amply sustains the assertion we have made above, that Dr. Harnack's testimony furnishes an irrefragable argument in favor of the Apostolic origin of Catholicism. Let its admissions be well noted.

In A.D. 250, there existed a Catholic Church, which was a "political commonwealth," *i.e.*, an organized corporate society, "furnished with fixed forms of every kind," "grounded in a doctrine of faith," *i.e.*, the Catholic faith was established by ecclesiastical authority; it was "a formulated faith, a theology"; there was an established ceremonial liturgy; "institute of worship"; conducted by "priests," and a received canon of inspired Scripture of the New Testament. That these were "instead of independent Christians" is a blundering and nonsensical statement. And that individuality of character and heroic virtue, generous, fervent enthusiasm for Christ and the Gospel were wanting in the period between A.D. 250 and A.D. 313, the era of the most terrible persecutions, of the most numerous martyrdoms, is a flagrant and capricious flying in the face of palpable historical facts.

The confessed reality of the condition of the Catholic Church in the middle of the third century, gives to the cause of Catholicism rightful and complete possession of the whole ground as the genuine Christian religion. It has the claim of prescription and possession, from which it cannot be ousted, except by clear and conclusive proof that a different kind of Christianity preceded it, in the interval between A.D. 30 and A.D. 250, and was transformed during that interval into this new species by some process of evolution, not a normal and legitimate development, but an essential alteration.

We have no quarrel with the idea of development in doctrine, in ritual, and in ecclesiastical organization. There must have been such a development in a living, organic body, which began in infancy and grew to adult age.

Neither do we repudiate the assimilation of Græco-Roman elements into the constitution and theology of the Church. It is one of the most striking evidences that the mission of Jesus Christ was in the same order of Divine Providence which rules the world, that He came just in time to blend Jewish tradition, Greek culture, and Roman jurisprudence into a combination of irresistible force

for the subjugation of civilized mankind, and the civilization of the outlying barbarous hordes of the Roman empire.

The contention is concerning the origin, the rise, the starting-point, the germs, of the development ; the dominating force which governed the expansion and growth of the little, humanly-feeble folk of the disciples into a world-wide kingdom. Judaism, Greek philosophy, and Roman polity, were a preparation for the gospel and the kingdom of Christ, as Clement of Alexandria and Justin, in their far-seeing wisdom, perceived and proclaimed. The gospel and the kingdom which Jesus Christ personally announced, of which He made His apostles the heralds and commissioned legates, was the veritable authentic Christianity, the religion, the world-conquering power, which shows its genuine, advanced development in the third century ; which was served and not dominated by all the Græco-Roman elements which it absorbed and purified.

The Christianity of Christ, the Christianity of the Apostles, the Christianity of the second, the third, and the fourth centuries ; the Christianity of the scattered and persecuted flocks, hunted to death by the heathen emperors, and that of the victorious Constantine ; the Christianity of the *cœnaculum*, and of the hall of the Nicene Council, was the same. Its soul is the Catholic Faith, its body is the Catholic Church, its author is Jesus Christ. There is no break in its unity and continuity.

This is the Catholic contention. Dr. Harnack's contention is, that there are two breaks in the continuous unity. The gospel of Christ is separate from the gospel of the first Evangelists ; this, in turn, is far more widely separated from the dogmatic and ecclesiastical Christianity which is supposed to have originated among the Gentile Christians when they were imbued with Græco-Roman principles and ideas, became animated by a philosophical spirit, and directed by worldly maxims ; forgetting the lessons of the Gospel, and losing the first enthusiasm of the faithful disciples of Christ. Here, then, is the principal break of continuity, creating a wide chasm between the religion of the genuine gospel and the Christianity, which from a new and different source developed early and rapidly into Catholicism, which Dr. Harnack, more than once, explicitly calls a "superstition." In the last sentences of his smaller work, the "*Grundriss*," he thus defines its essential, specific nature : "Catholicism is not the Pope, nor the worship of the saints, nor the mass—these are consequences—but the false doctrine of the sacraments, of penance, of faith, and of authority in matters of faith." Here, then, in "the false doctrine of faith and of authority in matters of faith," is a principal characteristic difference of Catholicism from the "gospel." "Luther," he says, "once more lifted the gospel, placed it upon the lamp-stand, and

subordinated dogma to it." He might have added: "I, Dr. Harnack, complete his work by eliminating dogma from it." For, the "Christology" of the Lutheran Church is one of the features in which he finds it to have the resemblance of a "scrawny twin" to the Catholic Church. Dr. Harnack is no more a Lutheran than he is a Catholic; no more a Bible Christian than a churchman. His one aim is, to show that there is nothing dogmatic in the original Christian religion, in the gospel of Christ; and that Christianity became dogmatic by a transmutation of species and a subsequent evolution of Catholicism, the history of which he undertakes to describe.

The theory of Dr. Harnack is directly contradictory to the Catholic doctrine of faith and authority, not only in its consistent and strictly Catholic form, but also in every imperfect semi-Catholic form of those Protestant confessions which retain the idea of supernatural revelation and a rule of faith. It denies the authority of Christ, as a revealer of divine truths—specifically of those mysteries which are the fundamental articles of the Christian creed. It denies the authority of the Apostles as the heralds of Christ; and of the Scriptures of the New Testament, not merely as inspired, but as documents of divine revelation; and *a fortiori*, of the Catholic *Ecclesia Docens*.

The one, and only important point, therefore, to be argued, is the continuity of the divine, supernatural revelation and religion, the faith, and the authority which proposes the faith in the Church, from Christ, through the Apostles to their successors; the written and the unwritten word of God, whose authentic expression and legitimate development is dogmatic Christianity.

Let us examine, now, more closely what is Dr. Harnack's idea of the person and gospel of Jesus Christ.

He does not say explicitly whether he believes Jesus Christ to have been a mere man, or more than man, to have pre-existed or not to his human birth, to be the Son of God by His very nature, or only to have gained and received a higher degree of the same filial relation to God which is the privilege of all holy persons. The account which he gives of the Christology of early periods of Church history implies, however, that he rejects, altogether, the doctrines of the Trinity, and the Incarnation, and regards Jesus Christ as a mere man, the son of Joseph and Mary, chosen by God to proclaim the message of the gospel, to exhibit in his person a perfect example of human sanctity, to draw men to the love of God by the charm of his character, and in some way to act as the representative of God, the Lord, the Redeemer, and the Judge of men. In virtue of his character and office, he was the Messiah of his people, the Master of his disciples.

The gospel which he preached was the sovereignty of God; the high and perfect righteousness consisting in a supreme love of God and the love of the fellow-men; above all legal and ceremonial observances; of religious filiation to God as Father, on condition of repentance and humble confidence; remission of sins, and a secure hope of future glory and happiness in the kingdom of God. This gospel was embodied and personified in Jesus Christ, who awakened in his disciples an intense, enthusiastic devotion to himself, which constituted the religion of the first generation of Christians.

In respect to the miracles of Jesus Christ, Dr. Harnack expresses himself in a very ambiguous manner, and at last dismisses them with the exclamation, "How unfit they are, in and of themselves, to secure to the One to whom they are ascribed, after 1800 years, any kind of special importance." (Page 59.)

In respect to the great crowning miracle of the Resurrection, Dr. Harnack presents us with a hazy, confused, and ambiguous piece of criticism, which is a remarkable specimen of the mixture of German rationalism with German mysticism. Its practical outcome and effect is to sweep away all grounds of credibility from this grand, miraculous, divine fact, the corner-stone of Christianity.

"It is an often-repeated saying, that Christianity rests on the belief in the resurrection of Christ. When this, as often happens, is enlarged into the proposition that the resurrection of Christ is the most certain fact of the history of the world, one does not know whether to wonder most over the stupidity or the unbelief of this saying. One does not need to believe in a *fact*, and that which needs religious faith—that is, trust in God—can never be a fact which can stand firm, prescinding from such a faith. Before all, therefore, the question of history and the question of faith must be sharply distinguished."

Historically, the following points stand firm:

1. That no one of the enemies of Christ saw him after death.
2. That disciples of Christ, soon after his death, were convinced that they had seen him.
3. That the succession and number of these appearances cannot be ascertained with certainty.
4. That the disciples and Paul were convinced that they saw him, not in the crucified earthly body, but in heavenly glory; even the later, incredible accounts of the appearances of Christ, which strongly emphasize the corporeity, speak, nevertheless, at the same time of such a body as goes through closed doors, and is, therefore, no earthly body.
5. That Paul, indeed, does not assimilate the manifestation of Christ granted to him with any of his subsequent visions, yet, nevertheless describes it (Gal. i., 15) in these words, "when God

was pleased to reveal his Son *in me*," and still places it on a level with the appearance which others before him had seen.

Now, since the discovery of the empty sepulchre on the third day can by no means pass for a sure historical fact, because, where the account is given, it is connected with manifestly mythical features; and furthermore, because the way in which Paul (1 Cor. xv.) has described the resurrection directly excludes it; therefore, the conclusion follows, 1, that the notion here presented is remote from the original apprehension of the resurrection of Christ as a simple revivication of his mortal body; and, 2, that emphatically the question whether Jesus has arisen, can exist for no one who looks away from the character and worth of the person of Jesus; for the mere fact that followers and friends of Jesus were convinced that they had seen Him, while they also declare that He appeared to them in *heavenly* glory, furnishes, for one who is earnestly bent on establishing historical facts, not the least reason for the assumption that Jesus did *not* remain in the sepulchre.

Wherefore, in this case, history cannot furnish any succor to faith. Supposing the belief in the appearances of Jesus among the circle of his followers to have been—as it actually was—ever so firm; to believe, on account of appearances occurring to others, is an act of levity which will always avenge itself through recurring doubts. However, history does render a service to faith, inasmuch as it limits its scope, and thus points out to it the domain in which it belongs.

The question which history leaves open to faith is this: Was Jesus Christ entirely swallowed up by death, or, did he pass through the cross and sufferings to glory. *i.e.*, to life, power, and honor? The disciples, from their sentiment of what Jesus was, ought to have been convinced on this head, even without having seen him in glory (a consciousness of this is found in Luke xxiv., 26, "Ought not Christ to have suffered these things and to enter into his glory?"); and we may properly add to this, that no appearances of the Lord could have given them a personal conviction of his life, if their hearts had not received a permanent impression of his person. Faith in the eternal life of Christ, and in our eternal life, is not a foregoing condition to becoming disciples of Christ, but the ultimate confession of one who is a disciple. It has nothing at all to do with a knowledge of the form in which Jesus lives, but purely with the conviction that he is the Living Lord. The determination of the form became dependent on the extremely different conceptions concerning future life, resurrection, and the glorification of the body, which were prevalent in that period. At an epoch which was, relatively, very early, the conception of a resuscitation of the body of Christ appeared, because it

was this hope, in the case of their own future, which animated wide circles of pious persons. Faith in Jesus, as being, in spite of the death on the cross, the Living Lord, cannot be produced by rational arguments or authoritative decrees, but, in the same way that Paul acknowledged to have been the case with himself, when he said: "It pleased the Lord to reveal his Son *in me*."

The conviction that they had seen the Lord was, indeed, of the highest significance to the disciples, and made evangelists of them; but, what they saw cannot help us. The Christian of to-day confesses with Paul: "If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are, of all men, the most miserable." He believes in a future life with God for himself, because he believes that Christ lives. This is the specific character and paradox of Christian faith. Such convictions cannot, however, become every-day self-evident convictions to a deeply-feeling, earnestly-thinking being, standing in the midst of nature and death. One possesses them only so far as he lives with all his heart and mind in God; and the prayer is also here applicable: "Lord, I believe, help my unbelief." To act as if faith in eternal life is the simplest thing in the world, or a dogma to which one must submit his mind, is irreligious. The whole question concerning the resurrection, its nature and significance, became in later Christianity so entirely perverted, that men accustomed themselves to think of eternal life, even prescindng from Christ, as a certain expectation." (Page 26.)

It would require an entire article to untangle this flimsy web. It reveals a deep, religious longing and aspiration in the author for an assurance that there does exist a future life in God for those who are worthy of it, accompanied by wavering and misgiving; a subjective sentiment of a reason for hope that Jesus did enter into glory after death, as the precursor of his disciples, mingled with a hesitation, the result of a lack of a certain, objective ground of faith.

Of the grand fact and dogma of the resurrection, nothing is left, except a belief that the sanctity of Jesus, combined with his own firm expectation of eternal life in God, made his translation to glory in his spiritual nature credible. And besides, that some of the disciples may have had supernatural visions, which were real, and gave them a more vivid apprehension of that which they believed concerning their living and glorified Lord.

As to Dr. Harnack's conception of the character and office of Jesus Christ, and of the gospel which was exemplified in his person and taught in his preaching, it is true and good, as far as it is positive, but fatally deficient in its shortcomings. It is not so grossly and palpably absurd and incredible as the representations of Baur, Strauss, and Renan, and it contains an element of the su-

perhuman in the sense of superiority to our common humanity. But it is all the more dangerous on account of being more subtle, and evading the direct force of the arguments by which many able writers, and among them Dr. Fisher, of New Haven, have demolished the legendary and mythical hypotheses of the arch-sophists of Germany and France.

The person of Jesus Christ really possessed all the qualities, and exercised all the fascinating influence which Dr. Harnack ascribes to it. The gospel which he attributes to him was really contained in his gospel, with the exception of the elimination of all legal and external elements from religion. But these are not enough to make his personal character and Messianic office intelligible or even conceivable. They give us nothing more, unless in degree, than we have in St. Bernard and other Saints.

The whole mission of Jesus is unmeaning, unless it is regarded as the culmination of the work of the entire series of patriarchs, lawgivers, and prophets, from the beginning of the world, and the inauguration of the final and perfect world—religion, in which the kingdom of God upon the earth is realized and consummated. The exhibition of a perfect example of sanctity, and the preaching of a righteousness consisting in the love of God and man, with a disregard of the present life and the hope of a future life in God, presents no adequate idea of the character and work of the Messiah of God, the Redeemer and Saviour of mankind. It is a faint and feeble reflection of some features only of the authentic portrait in the gospels. Such a gospel as this is no sufficient cause of the Christian regeneration of the world. Consequently, Dr. Harnack is forced to represent it as an evanescent phenomenon. Historical Christianity, a new, different, and purely human construction must supplant it, before it has lasted a century. At last, Martin Luther, as a second Messiah, comes, to place the rescued gospel on the lamp-stand! And what has been the outcome of *his* mission? The production of some poor imitations and caricatures of Catholicism! It is a wonder, that at this day, honorable men and scholars should venture to pronounce the name of Luther in connection with the Gospel. And where is now the lamp-stand? In Berlin? What light is the lamp giving? When is it going to shine forth for the illumination of the nations? Does Dr. Harnack fancy that his version of the gospel is going to command the consent of Germany, England, America, and the "evangelical lands," with their "concilium of scientific theologians?" Does he expect that they will strangle Catholicism and its "scrawny twin," Lutheranism? Suppose that work accomplished; dogmatic, ritual, organized ecclesiastical Christianity swept away; what is to come next? It is amusing to think of Dr. Harnack's and Professor

Mitchell's pupils going forth from Berlin and Hartford to evangelize Germany, America, and the heathen world; to accomplish a work in which the Apostles failed. "It now remains to hold fast to and carry forward that which Luther began—*Gott schenke uns nur ein festes Herz, Muth, Demuth, und Geduld!*" (Outlines, p. 567.) This is mere cant, which does not sit well on a Berlin professor.

In respect to the means adopted by Jesus Christ for the preaching of the Gospel and the union of the disciples among themselves, Dr. Harnack expresses himself as follows :

"Jesus did not himself found a new religious community, but assembled a circle of disciples about Him, and committed the announcement of the Gospel to chosen Apostles."

There are some who think that we ought to regard the conception which the original community had of him, to have been that he was a second God, having one being with the Father, and that it is this concept by which all the language used and the judgments expressed by this community are rendered intelligible. But this hypothesis leads to the most violent perversions of their original utterances and the suppression or alteration of their characteristic features.

The contents of the faith of the disciples of Christ and of the common preaching which bound them to one another can be summed up as follows :

Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah promised by the prophets ; Jesus, through the divine resurrection, after death exalted to the right hand of God, will finally come again and visibly erect the kingdom. Whoever believes in Jesus, and through a sincere conversion calls on God as Father, and lives according to the precepts of Jesus, is a saint of God, and as such may be sure of the forgiving grace of God and a share in the future glory ; *i.e.*, the redemption.

The confession of the God of Israel as the Father of Jesus, and of Jesus as the Christ or as the "Lord," attained its completion in the witness of the possession of the Spirit, who, as the Spirit of God, assured to each individual his calling into the kingdom, bound him personally with God himself, and was the pledge of future glory. The confession of the Father, the Son and the Spirit is thus the unfolding of the faith that Jesus is the Christ, but it was not the intention in this confession to express the equality of the three great powers or the similarity of the relations of the Christian to the same ; much rather the Father comes into view in it as the God and Father above all, the Son as the revealer, and the Spirit as a possession." (Pp. 68, 69.)

This makes a clean sweep of the two fundamental articles of the

Christian Creed—the Trinity in Unity in God, and the Incarnation of the Second Divine Person. What the Son and Spirit are is left vague, but the denial of their equality as distinct Persons, with the Person of the Father, as a dogma of original Christian faith, is unmistakable. Of course, with these two articles of faith, all the other articles of the Catholic Faith as dogmas and the dogmatic profession of faith as the basis of the entire order of the Catholic Church disappears.

This is the precise scope of Dr. Harnack's thesis and argument. "They (dogmas) are esteemed in the Christian Churches as the truths revealed in the Holy Scriptures, the acknowledgment of which is the condition precedent to that felicity which religion places in prospect. Since the professors of the Christian religion did not possess from the beginning such dogmas, or, in the sense of a system combining single dogmas, such a dogma, dogmatic history has the task of finding out, first, the origin of dogmas, or the dogma, and secondly, describing the development or transmutation of the same.

"The moment when a dogma became a universally acknowledged article of faith constitutive of the Church was the latter part of the third century." (P. 3.)

The transmutation of original Christianity into Catholicism was, therefore, a change from the religion of the Gospel without dogmas into a dogmatic Christianity, and the period of transition was between the latter part of the first and the latter part of the third century.

There is an adroit introduction into the definition of dogma of an element which much facilitates the effort to contrast the doctrinal character of the primitive church with that of the church already confessedly Catholic.

"Dogmas are the Christian doctrines of faith, having for their contents the knowledge of God, the world, and the means of salvation ordained by God, in formulated concepts, which are expressed in terms suited for a mode of treatment which is both scientific and apologetic." (*Ibid.*)

The phrase "formulated concepts" is sophistical, and furnishes a verbal cover for the contradictory and mutually destructive principles of Harnack's theory of the Gospel. It is plain enough that Christ and the apostles did not promulgate the Gospel under the form of a systematic theology, and scientific definitions like those of the great councils. It is not, however, of the essence of dogma that it should have this kind of formulation. A doctrine revealed by God and proposed by the authority which He has appointed, with the command to give the firm assent of the mind to it on the motive of the divine veracity, is an article or dogma of faith. The

true religion has always been dogmatic, although the dogmas which were required to be believed as a condition of salvation were fewer in number before the promulgation of the Gospel than after. The one great article of faith, from the beginning, was the doctrine of the one God, the Creator and sovereign Lord. The second article was the coming of the promised Redeemer. Dr. Harnack distinctly affirms that Jesus Christ was a "revealer," and he must, therefore, have made a revelation of some objective truths which he required his disciples to believe. The sovereign right of God to the supreme love of men, the relation of a Father to his sons, in which he becomes to them the bestower of forgiveness, grace, and eternal life; the quality of Messiah and Lord which Jesus Christ claimed for himself, and all the contents of the Gospel which he proclaimed and committed to the Apostles, are so many objective truths, doctrines, articles of faith, by which the disciples were bound together in one communion, according to Dr. Harnack's own exposition. The Patriarchal and Jewish religions were, therefore, dogmatic, and the original Christian religion was dogmatic. If the formulated concepts by which the revealed truths were expressed were true and faithful representations, then these dogmas, or this dogma, in the sense of a system, must be regarded as only a more scientific, explicit, and expanded form of the enunciation of the truths of faith. The kernel and germ of dogmatic and theological development is to be found, therefore, in the original Gospel of Christ and the Apostles, and not in any foreign seed sown by Greek philosophers.

Nothing can be imagined more inept, unphilosophical, and unhistorical, than the theory of Dr. Harnack, which isolates the mission of Jesus Christ and the Apostles from the course of events both before and after the Christian era. The person, mission, and Gospel of Jesus Christ are reduced to the most insignificant proportions. The effect of his life, teaching, and death is small and evanescent. He does not found a true kingdom of God, a world-religion on the earth. He is not the author of "Historical Christianity." Another religion, a substitute for the religion of Christ and the Apostles, rises on its ruins and dominates the world. After fifteen centuries, the coarse, violent, inconsistent, impure Luther attempts to renew the work in which Christ failed, with such results of dissension and confusion that no one can now be found to enlighten mankind concerning the true significance of Christ and his Gospel but a Berlin professor, from whose badly-written "Grundriss" unhappy students of theology are to learn what we have failed to discover in the writings of the four Evangelists and St. Paul.

The history of dogma is one branch of ecclesiastical history.

Ecclesiastical history goes back to the beginning of the history of mankind, and follows it down through all the phases and periods of the kingdom of God on earth, the Church, which has always existed among the kingdoms and nations of the earth. The history of dogma is the history of that revelation of truth and law which God has made to men through the Church by the ministry of its prophets and apostles, but especially through His Son. It is the history of the beginning, the progress, and the final completion of the revelation made to the Church, and through the Church to mankind. It is, moreover, the history of the distinct proposition of the contents of the revelation by authority; the proposition of the truths explicitly revealed in more and more distinct terms and formulas; the definition of truths implicitly revealed, and the development of dogma in the strict sense, *i.e.*, of doctrine declared and defined as pertaining to divine and Catholic faith. Closely connected with this is the history of dogmatic theology, which, besides the scientific and systematic exposition of the faith, is a philosophical development of that which is *virtually* contained in the divine revelation and educed from its principles and dogmas by reasoning.

Inseparable from the history of dogmatic Christianity is the history of the sources of Catholic doctrine, Scripture, especially the New Testament, and tradition; of the apostolic and ecclesiastical order established in the Church by Jesus Christ; of the entire system of Catholicism. It is conceded, as we have seen, that this is found existing and universal in the third century, without any perceptible traces of a transmutation from a prior and different state and form of the Christian religion. Catholicism is in possession, possessed of all the rights of prescription. All the confusion and obscurity which we find in the treatment of the whole topic of the beginnings of Christianity by those who dispute these rights, arises from their making a question about the origin of Catholicism, with a previous assumption that it is not to be sought in the Apostles and their Master. The question is unanswerable according to their sense; it is an enigma for them which is insoluble. The sacred and the ecclesiastical documents of primitive Christianity, if they are taken as a homogeneous and harmonious whole, and the canonical scriptures, recognized as authentic, present a clear intelligible history and system of doctrines, a unity, embracing the mission of Christ, the Apostles, and their successors. Dr. Harnack is perfectly aware that his cause cannot be sustained except by breaking this continuous and harmonious unity. Therefore he divides and separates it into fragments, that he may deal with each one apart. He selects, on a subjective and arbitrary criterion of his own, what portions of the history contained in the sacred

writings he considers authentic and credible. More than this, he lets a skepticism about the certainty of his own hypothesis concerning the person and work of Christ, and even of His existence appear, and pretends to no more than a probability for his own theoretical view, which leaves the whole question still open to critical discussion.

Now, all Protestants who profess to be orthodox are bound by their own confessions and by their system to reject totally the theory of the anti-Christian school of German theological professors at Berlin and elsewhere, and to adopt the Catholic thesis concerning the origin and development of dogmatic Christianity. They are thus left without a spot to stand upon in their contention against Catholicism. They are logically and historically compelled to accept the third century as the witness and exponent of apostolic Christianity in every sense. Hence, even some of those in Germany who wish to pass for genuine Lutherans are beginning to slide down toward the position of those who arrogate to themselves the title of critical and scientific theologians. The same movement is beginning in England and America. It is becoming more and more evident that there is no stability in doctrine or in ecclesiastical order anywhere except in the Catholic Church. The Bible, Christology, organic unity, have no security and no immovability except on the foundation of the Rock of Peter. The encroaching tide must sweep away all those human and temporary foundations on which the structures have been erected which have been designed to be both Protestant and Orthodox. Learned and able Protestant writers who have attacked with signal success the anti-Christian critics in defence of the New Testament and of some fundamental dogmas of Christianity, are inconsistent semi-Catholics. In their arguments for the authenticity and inspiration of the books of the New Testament, and the apostolic origin of the dogmas retained in the principal reformed confessions, they write as Catholics. But when they attempt to prove that other essential parts of Catholicism had a human origin, and that a transmutation from Apostolic to Catholic Christianity was imperceptibly effected during the second and third centuries, they write quite in the spirit and according to the method of Harnack and his fellow-professors. The only question is, whether to keep or to give up the Christ of the Evangelists and Apostles together with the Catholic faith and Church. Christ and the Church are one and inseparable. If the Church of historical Christianity is a post-apostolic invention, the Divine Christ proclaimed by the Church is a similar invention, and as only a human Church, so also only a human Christ is left. And this is precisely the contention of Dr. Harnack and his compeers.

At the present time it is the only serious contention remaining. The controversy with those who maintain that Christ, in the fulfillment of his mission as the truly Divine Mediator, established some kind of Christian religion different from Catholicism, which underwent a substantial change during the first three centuries, is really finished. Either historical Christianity, Catholicism, has Christ for its author, or He founded nothing fit to be permanent and world-wide. Either, therefore, He did not intend and attempt to introduce and establish a universal religion, or He failed in His undertaking. In this failure to do any divine work, all reason and evidence for any divine character in His Messiahship and in His Person vanishes. Nothing remains of the Christian idea of Christ except some traits of His Humanity. The divine Christ, banished from His world, and Christianity abolished, there remains no hope for mankind, and the earth becomes a desert, a howling wilderness, peopled by wild beasts and defenceless herds for them to prey upon.

There is no reason, however, to abandon ourselves to such pessimistic views and gloomy forebodings. Christ has established His kingdom on the earth, and of His reign there shall be no end, but a glorious consummation in the kingdom of the heavens. We know that our Redeemer liveth; that He came down from heaven, lived, died, rose again, founded a universal and perpetual church and religion, and will come again to judge the world. This is not only matter of faith, but, in so far as it is already fulfilled, it is matter of fact and history; it is the greatest fact, the principal chapter in the universal history of mankind. Historical Christianity is the religion of the divine Christ, and historical Christianity is Catholicism—not as an evolution by a transformation of species, but from the beginning, and by a development from the original germ. This thesis and contention I hope to make the topic of a separate article in the next number of the REVIEW.

AUGUSTINE F. HEWIT.

THE IDEA OF EVOLUTION.

BOUNDLESS in extent and varied in form as is the visible universe, there is nothing in it that fills the mind with greater admiration than its perfect unity. Notwithstanding its multiplicity, we see it in every respect reduced to harmony—its smallest portions as well as its wide-extended realms; its motions and operations no less than the make-up of its manifold parts.

The bodies that compose it, whether organic or inorganic, resemble one another in shape, structure, and constitution to such an extent that in spite of individual peculiarities, they are all reduced to certain species and the species are ranged under genera and classes, which are still further unified, until, by the process of classification, we arrive, in each of three great kingdoms of nature, at very few general types. There is, moreover, in their activity, however varied, such regularity that not one phenomenon, not one molecule in the wide universe seems to be exempt from laws more or less universal.

Another kind of unity pervading all creation is that of continuity, both of being and of becoming. For we observe an uninterrupted gradation of perfection in the numberless forms which nature exhibits, from the lowest up to the highest, one species or family succeeding another, and every higher class or kingdom being joined to the lower, without a gap in the sequence. No less is it manifest that every organism commences its existence in a state of imperfection and reaches its due completion by gradual growth and development, according to fixed laws. And as the parts, so also has the whole attained to its present perfection only gradually. To judge merely from the standpoint of science, the universe was first in a confused or chaotic condition, and was reduced to order little by little, its different elements being separated or combined by a slow but regular process. In like manner was organic life also produced successively, the plants before the animals, the lower species before the higher, and at last man, the crown and king of all.

Lastly, there is in nature unity of design and purpose. For parts are everywhere so adjusted to one another as to form a perfect whole; and the whole again, by its intrinsic constitution, is adapted to certain functions; individual beings are arranged in species, which they preserve by reproduction; the inferior realms are subservient to those of superior grades, to whose wants they

minister; all the heavenly bodies, by their mutual dependence, constitute one universal system, which, though it comprises numberless parts and subordinate spheres, yet is moving in undisturbed and perfect order.

What are all the different natural sciences but an inquiry into universal unity? What object have they in view other than to determine the species and classes under which all things are ranged, to prove the existence of general laws and to register them with the greatest possible exactness, to show the adaptation of organs to functions, to set forth the constitution and development of organic bodies, and to gather from the strata of the earth the history of its successive changes? For centuries have scientists been engaged in such investigations, and yet they have accomplished only a part of their task.

Should we then wonder if the philosophers also have long mused on the unity of the universe? What phenomenon could call more loudly for their attention, or what could more imperatively demand to be traced back to its cause than unity so wide and comprehensive, so striking and so perfect, though existing in an infinite variety of beings, among parts indefinitely small and systems extended far beyond the range of our perception? Indeed, this subject has always occupied the minds of thinking men from the dawning of philosophy in Greece and India down to our days.

In what conclusions has such long-continued speculation resulted? The philosophers of all ages fully agree that unity, perfect and universal, must originate in a universal cause. If there are men who, contradicting the reality or knowableness of causes, deny that the order of the world is an effect produced by a cause, they must be regarded as having renounced all philosophy. It is also unanimously admitted that the universal cause is not produced, but must, of necessity, be self-existent. One exception, and one of extraordinary weight, might seem necessary to make. In the opinion of Herbert Spencer, philosophy must do without a self-existent being. He alleges two reasons for thinking so. First, as he says, self-existence is inconceivable.

“In the first place, it is clear that by self-existence we especially mean an existence independent of any other—not produced by any other; the assertion of self-existence is simply an indirect denial of creation. In thus excluding the idea of any antecedent cause, we necessarily exclude the idea of a beginning; for to admit the idea of a beginning—to admit that there was a time when the existence had not commenced—is to admit that its commencement was determined by something, or was caused; which is a contradiction. Self-existence, therefore, necessarily means existence without a beginning; and to form a conception of self-existence is to form

a conception of existence without a beginning. Now by no mental effort can we do this. To conceive existence through infinite past time implies the conception of infinite past time, which is an impossibility.”¹

Secondly, self-existence, as Mr. Spencer thinks, does not contribute towards explaining the origin of the cosmical order.

“To this let us add that even were self-existence conceivable, it would not in any sense be an explanation of the universe.”²

Does not this view, held by the leading genius of modern thought, demand a qualification of the statement made above concerning the agreement of all philosophers in admitting a self-existent First Cause? Yes, indeed, it would imply such a demand, and should heedfully be taken into account, were it not contradicted by Mr. Spencer himself at the very moment that he gives expression to it. A conception which can be explained and resolved is certainly not one that is altogether impossible or that cannot be formed by mental effort. But in the passage quoted above he unfolds the conception of self-existence; he is able to define it by telling what is necessarily included in it and what is excluded from it, and he does so with tolerable correctness and clearness. Self-existence, he says, is an indirect denial of creation; it excludes an antecedent cause, and hence, also, a beginning; it is an existence unproduced and independent. Undoubtedly, then, Mr. Spencer himself has a conception of self-existence, a true conception, and one so clear that he can distinguish by it the self-existent from any other being, and so distinct that he is able to analyze it. Mr. Spencer's argumentation, if conclusive at all, merely goes towards evincing that the self-existent can neither be represented in imagination nor be fully comprehended by the human intellect, nor be thought of as existing in time. All these conclusions will readily be granted by any one who, by evolving its conception, knows the self-existent to be immaterial, infinite, and unchangeable. For being immaterial, it is not perceptible to any sense, whether external or internal; being infinite, it exceeds the range of finite understanding; being unchangeable, it exists beyond all time. Yet, though such, it is not inconceivable; it can be represented, though not by the sense, yet by a spiritual cognitive power; it can be grasped, though not adequately, yet to some extent, inasmuch as to be distinguished from any other entity; it can be thought of, though not as subject to succession, yet as resting in the fulness of its perfections in tranquil eternity.

Mr. Spencer most explicitly asserts, also, the possibility of accounting for the universe by the self-existence of its cause; nay,

¹ *First Principles*, § II.

² *Ibid.*

rather he maintains the necessity of so accounting for it. The following are his own words :

"We cannot think at all about the impressions which the external world produces on us without thinking of them as caused, and we cannot carry out an inquiry concerning their causation without inevitably committing ourselves to the hypothesis of a First Cause."

But a First Cause is plainly one that is unproduced and independent as to its existence, and, therefore, one that is self-existent. Consequently, in accordance with Mr. Spencer's own assertions, we cannot carry out our inquiry concerning the causation of the impressions which the external world produces on us without committing ourselves to the hypothesis of a self-existent cause.

Nor is this necessity merely subjective, illusory, or disconnected with objective truth. It might seem that such is, in fact, the view taken by the apostle of the understanding ; for, no sooner has he mentioned the First Cause, than he tells us that its conception is self-contradictory, from whatever side it is considered. Were he really to maintain that our mind, by an irresistible intrinsic necessity, imposes on us the most absurd notions, and forces us to base on them the explanation of the universe, he could no longer regard philosophy as a rational science, but would be compelled to look upon it as a mere mental delusion. Such a suicidal self-contradiction we cannot attribute to the leader of modern speculation. The interpretation to be put on his words is plain enough. He denies the possibility of a definite, but forcibly asserts the necessity of an indefinite conception of the First Cause. It is in this sense, also, and in this sense only, that he terms the same cause an unknowable power.

We repeat, then, all philosophers, Herbert Spencer included, are unanimous in tracing back the existence and order of the world to a self-existent universal cause. He who makes an exception must renounce the name of philosopher and profess himself a destroyer of reasoned knowledge.

There was, however, at any time, the greatest difference of opinion as to the nature of the self-existent cause, and as to the kind of operation by which it has produced this well-ordered universe. What essential attributes the being has, which, existing of itself, is the cause of all other existence ; how, absolutely independent and eternal as it is, it brings into being things that are dependent and temporal ; and, how it reduces them to such wonderful order and unity—these are questions on which the philosophers disagree, and branch off into schools as hostile to one another as armies ar-

¹ *Ibid.*, § 12.

rayed on fields of battle. The discord is a sad proof of the insufficiency of the human mind to solve the most important of all problems with such clearness, and freedom from error, as may engender universal and necessary conviction. But, will this dissent last forever? May not our mental acquirements, with the progress of many centuries, at last reach a degree of perfection which will qualify us for the discovery of the remotest truths? Many think, indeed, that so happy an advancement has been made. Modern philosophy prides herself, at least, on having unravelled the mystery of the world's unity, and, on having unravelled it by a theory which, reducing phenomena to laws and effects to causes with striking evidence, is beginning to gain universal acceptance.

II.

It is claimed that nature itself, as soon as it was more keenly observed, suggested a new departure in its explanation. The old philosophy regarded the world as the work of an external cause, giving existence and shape to every particular kind of bodies and living creatures in this infinite variety of things. But, while all around us millions of plants and animals grow out of shapelessness to beauty, and develop from formless germs to organical structures of wonderful perfection by their own vital operation, the thought seemed to present itself that, as individual bodies, so the whole material world also might have risen out of a chaotic condition by its own inherent power, and might have put on its present form by an evolution from within. Espousing this view, modern philosophers compare the origin of the universe to the growth of an organism from a protoplasm, which, by its own activity, passing through successive stages, advances from indeterminateness to determinateness, from imperfection to perfection. Evolution is thus looked upon as the key to the solution of the riddle which puzzled all preceding ages, and as the theory which sheds abundant light where heretofore black darkness was reigning.

The new idea may, at first sight, seem to be clear and definite enough. Still, it is worth while to analyze it and set it forth with all possible exactness. What constituents have rendered it pregnant with such important consequences, or have concentrated on it so intense a light? What definition has recent philosophy given of it?

"The general meaning of evolution," says Mr. James Sully, "may be defined as follows: Evolution includes all theories respecting the origin and order of the world which regard the higher and more complex forms of existence as following, and dependent on, the lower and simpler forms; which represent the course of the world as a gradual transition from the indeterminate to the

determinate, from the uniform to the varied; and which assume the cause of this process to be immanent in the world itself that is transformed.”¹

Mr. Herbert Spencer conceives of evolution as a process during which matter and concomitant motion pass from an indefinite, incoherent homogeneity to a definite, coherent heterogeneity.² Further discussion will show that the definitions given by these two philosophers differ, not in meaning, but in explicitness only.

Two elements are necessarily contained in evolution thus defined and assumed as a key to account for the origin and the order of the universe; one universal power which, being immanent in the world, produces in the same substratum different successive forms, one dependent on the other, and, one universal law which regulates the production of forms, so as to lead those succeeding another to ever greater perfection and determinateness, and to reduce those existing simultaneously, to harmony and unity. For, were the different forms of existence not produced by one and the self-same immanent power, they would be altogether disconnected and would not succeed one another in the same subject, and, were their production not presided over by one and the self-same law, they would not be consecutive in regular order, nor would they tend towards ever higher perfection, and, closely uniting, constitute one system. Accordingly, any complete theory of evolution has to make good a two-fold position. It must evince that a multitude of forms successively existing, notwithstanding their difference, belong to the same substratum, and are converted into one another by one and the self-same immanent power; and it must, moreover, show that they are subject to the same law, which, regulating their production and conversion, establishes among them gradation and unity.

The productive power, immanent in the world transformed, presents a two-fold aspect. We may consider it only in its bearings on the successive forms to which it gives origin, or we may search into its nature and into the ground of its existence. By an inquiry of the latter kind it will be found to be either produced or unproduced and self-existent. If it is produced, it must have been created, and then it is dependent on an ultimate cause which is supramundane. If unproduced, it is itself the ultimate cause of all being which then is intramundane and indistinct from the forces working in the universe. Thus a two-fold theory also of evolution has sprung up. The one traces back the forms of existence to their proximate immanent causes, which as to their nature and origin it leaves untouched or regards as finite and dependent. By

¹ *Encyclopædia Britannica*, article on “Evolution.”

² *First Principles*, § 145.

so doing it derives special forms from special sources, without reducing all existence to one supreme principiant, and explains, not the entire universe, but its particular realms only. The other goes back to the ultimate cause of all being, considering as such an unproduced principiant intrinsic to the world, and, therefore, accounts for all order and all existence, retracing all to one supreme source, so as to establish universal unity. The former is the scientific, the latter the philosophical theory of evolution. For it is science that confines itself to particular classes of phenomena and inquires into their proximate causes only, whereas it is the business of philosophy to search all being, to penetrate to the ultimate cause, and to ascend to the supreme and universal principles.

The scientific theory has thus far not yet been adopted by science in general, but only by one special branch of it, by biology, in order to account for the origin of species. In other words, it has been employed to explain only the forms of organic life. Hence, Mr. Conn quite correctly renders the idea of evolution now-a-days prevailing among scientists.

"As ordinarily used," he says, "in most scientific books of to-day, evolution, organic evolution, and the theory of descent are practically synonymous terms, and each of these is used to indicate the theory that all species of animals and plants existing to-day have been derived from others living in the past by direct descent, and that they themselves will give rise in the future to other still different species. It further implies that if the histories of animals living to-day could be traced backward, they would all be found to converge, until finally they met a common ancestor living in the remote past. In short, evolution, as the term is commonly understood, is chiefly a denial of the former belief that species were independently created, and the replacement of this belief with the opposite. It assumes that no species is an independent creation, but that all are derived from past forms now extinct. This is evolution as Darwin understood it; this is the common understanding of the term to-day in scientific literature."¹

The philosophical theory has given evolution the widest possible extension and the profoundest depth, stretching its meaning until it covers the existence of all things, explains all order, transcends all particular sciences, and reduces all that is to absolute oneness. This theory derives all being, mind, as well as matter, organic life, as well as inorganic action, from one and the self-same source, so however as always to draw out the higher from the lower forms; regards the supreme and general source of being as a principle

¹ H. W. Conn, *Evolution of To-day*, pp. 5, 6.

immanent in nature, disavowing any cause which from without the visible world gives origin to anything, shapes laws, or initiates order; and considers the universal immanent principle at once as the substratum in which all forms of existence inhere, and as the cause by which they are produced as its own determinations. Such are, in short, the outlines of the idea of evolution as set forth by modern philosophers.

"All theories of evolution properly so-called," says Mr. Sully, "regard the physical world as a gradual transition from the indeterminate to the determinate, from the simple to the complex; look upon the development of organic life as conditioned by that of the inorganic world, and view the course of mental life, both of the individual and of the race, as correlated with a material process."¹

What is meant by the correlation between *mental life* and a *material process*, Mr. Sully explains in a passage subjoined. He tells us that, if the material and the spiritual were considered as two realities and not as one, their correlation would be left unexplained or could be only referred to an arbitrary action of a supernatural (*supramundane*) cause, an assumption utterly unsatisfactory to scientific minds. Evidently he means to deny a real distinction between spirit and matter.

He also looks on the power which, being immanent in the world, starts both material processes and mental life, as uncreated and self-existent. The doctrine of evolution is, as he says, within the ground which it covers antagonistic to that of direct creation. As points of opposition between the two doctrines, he marks out the following. Creation supposes the first being as infinitely perfect; evolution, on the contrary, as most imperfect and indeterminate. Creation is the descent of the finite from the infinite, the imperfect from the perfect; evolution is the origin of the perfect from the imperfect. Creation requires a cause distinct from the universe and extrinsic to it; evolution one intrinsic to it and indistinct from it. Creation is an act of the free will, and, consequently, supernatural and without law; evolution is a necessary act of the nature of things, and hence a natural process according to law. Denying the infinite as the first being and First Cause, denying the origin of the imperfect from the perfect, the finite from the infinite denying causation by the free act of a supramundane agent, are tantamount to the denial of all creation,—not of creation only of the successive forms of life and matter, but of creation also of the substratum in which they are, and of the power by which they are directly produced.

¹ *Encyclopædia Brit.*, art. "Evolution."

The "First Principles" of Herbert Spencer are nothing else than a full explanation of the philosophical theory of evolution. Reduced to general outlines, this renowned work presents the following positions:

Evolution is an integration of matter and concomitant dissipation of motion, during which the matter passes from an indefinite, incoherent homogeneity to a definite, coherent heterogeneity, and during which the retained motion undergoes a parallel transformation.¹

Evolution so defined is the universal process through which all kinds of existence, individually and as a whole, pass during the ascending halves of their histories; the process displayed equally in the material world and in mental life, in the earliest changes which the universe at large is supposed to have undergone, and in those latest changes which we trace in society;² the process into which every particular science resolves the phenomena observed in its peculiar province, when it is to give a rational interpretation of them. Nor is evolution only one in kind; it is also one in fact. For it is not only general, but also resting on one all-pervading principle. For further analyzed and explained, it is found to imply four principal factors: instability of the homogeneous, multiplication of effects, segregation, and equilibration; and these factors again, if closely examined, are seen to be deducible as necessary consequences from the persistence of one force. This ultimate conclusion being reached, we are brought to the conception of the entire plexus of changes presented by each concrete phenomenon, and by the aggregate of concrete phenomena, as a manifestation of one fundamental fact. Then also it is that all the different realms of nature are recognized as parts of one cosmos, that all sciences are completely unified, and that philosophy, which is nothing else than completely-unified knowledge, is built up and brought to perfection.

But what is this persistent, all-pervading force? It is a force which never comes into existence or goes out of it, is never increasing nor decreasing; is never changing, but always remains unchanged in quantity throughout the ages. It is the absolute force, of which we are indefinitely conscious as the necessary correlative of the force we know, the unknowable power, the unknown cause, which is behind all phenomena and all impressions, an unconditioned, absolute reality without beginning and end.³

The persistent force is not supramundane, not a creator existing from eternity. It is altogether immanent in the world. For, the universally existent forces of attraction and repulsion, considered

¹ *First Principles*, § 145.

² *Ibid.*, § 186.

³ *Ibid.*, § 62.

as the constituents of all things, are not a creator, but are complementary aspects of it, forms or modes, under which the conditions of consciousness oblige us to represent it. The particular existences are not beneath it or dependent on it as a higher extrinsic cause, but involve it as a common element, or as a general reality lying at their bottom. This will be plain, as soon as we understand how the persistent force comes to be the absolute, unknowable power. Existence is continued manifestation; and things knowable to us are nothing but manifestations, those of them which are vivid making up the outer world, those which are faint the inner world or the ego. But every manifestation carries with it the irresistible implication of a power that manifests itself to us, and, consequently, all of them the implication of a power that is always present in our consciousness. For the power implied in every manifestation must, while everything changes, remain unchanged, and must, while thought succeeds to thought, alone persist in our mind. And yet, though always present in us, it cannot be definitely known. For, as all particular manifestations of whatever form and under whatever conditions pass away, it alone remaining constant, every particular conception must be denied of it by the philosopher. It therefore becomes unknowable, unformed, unlimited, unconditioned. The consciousness we have of it is only a general, indefinite notion, the abstract of all thoughts, ideas, or conceptions, the raw material of thought, to which in thinking we give definite forms. And, as in consciousness, so it is also in reality. Continued manifestation being existence, it follows, that the power implied in every manifestation and always present in the mind, is a general, abstract existence; that it is the element common to all things, that which is, in itself, unformed and indeterminate, yet is formed and determined in every particular being.¹

The theory of evolution, as thus set forth, the theory of the evolution of all from one self-existent immanent principle, is nowadays considered not only as the fullest explanation ever given of the unity and order of the universe, being a system of perfect monism, plainly reasoned out in all its details, but also the only one which, as overcoming any kind of dualism, gives satisfaction to the human mind. For, if one and the self-same principle is not the source of all, existing unity cannot prevail throughout creation. If this one principle is not supposed to be immanent in the world, nature is not explained from itself, but rather is rendered unintelligible; that which is plain and visible in it being accounted for by something unseen and unknown. And, if this one immanent principle is not regarded as absolutely independent and self-existent, it be-

¹ *Ibid.*, §§ 26, 40, 41, 44.

comes necessary to conceive of the universe as conditioned without perceiving any cause or condition on which it is dependent, and to ascribe the orderly and constant succession of phenomena, not to an agent working according to law, but to arbitrary creative will.

Accordingly, the evolutionary theory is looked on as the highest wisdom ever attained ; as the one true philosophy, ignored in times gone by, invented in our enlightened century, to be more fully developed in ages yet to come. It is, we are told, the great truth, which science reveals the more clearly, the more it advances in exactness and comprehensiveness.

That the theory is atheistical—for, openly or covertly, it does away with the personal Deity—does not bewilder its admirers. Having, as enlightened thinkers, taken unity for the first criterion of truth, they are determined to part with all the ancient views upholding dualism, however strongly supported they may be by universal conviction.

III.

We have, thus far, sketched evolution only in general outlines. It has been described as a gradual transition from the indeterminate to the determinate, but the several stages of this process have not been marked out. The cause which is thought to produce the successive forms of existence has been said to be self-existent and immanent in the world ; but its necessary attributes have, as yet, not been determined. A law, it was maintained, must govern the succession of the various forms, because they could not otherwise result in order and unity ; but, the nature of such a law has not yet been defined. These are questions which to discuss volumes are required. Still, the general idea which we have reached must not be undervalued. Presenting to the mind what is essential to evolution, and what, therefore, is common to all its interpretations, it will lead us to some general conclusions ; it will, if duly examined, render manifest whether the very essence of evolution, or only some of its incidental features, are repugnant to reason ; whether all, or only some, evolutionary theories are open to objection. To deduce from the general idea truths of so high importance, we need only compare the elements which it involves, and see whether they harmonize or disagree with one another.

Many a reader may be astonished at the disclosure in which a careful examination will result. We find that the First Cause, from which all forms of existence are successively developed, has been clothed with two diametrically opposed attributes, and that, either of the two attributes is essentially incompatible with an advance from indeterminateness to determinateness. For, inasmuch as the

First Cause is assumed to be immanent in the world gradually transformed and determined, it is rendered essentially indeterminate; and, inasmuch as it is assumed to be self-existent, it must be understood to be fully determined by its own essence. Being essentially indeterminate, it cannot determine itself by its own activity; being fully determined by its own essence, it cannot undergo a process by which it is gradually determined. A more startling contradiction could not be conceived. Proofs shall be advanced for each of the propositions laid down.

The First Cause, immanent as a universal power in a world which is, at first, altogether indeterminate, must, of necessity, be also indeterminate. The whole is necessarily endowed with the perfections essential to its constituents, and especially with those essential to its main constituent.

But, according to evolutionary views, the universe is constituted by the First Cause immanent in it as its main, if not as its only, component part. Consequently it must be conceived of as having reached determinateness, if the First Cause is supposed to be determinate, and can be thought of as indeterminate only when this same cause is left in indeterminateness. And even when the world comes to be fully determined by the forms of existence with which it is clothed in never-interrupted succession, still the First Cause must be conceived of as being in itself indeterminate. For it is distinct from the determining forms, they being effects produced by its immanent activity, and is even separable from them, because they continually come and disappear, whilst it alone persists. It is that which underlies them all as a common element, as the cause that gives them being, as the substratum that receives and sustains them. Accordingly it must be considered as a general entity which, being in itself indefinite, remains steadfast under the ever-changing particular determinations. So, in fact, Mr. Spencer has described it; for, as we have seen, according to him it is the element common to all things, that which, being in itself unformed and indeterminate, is formed and determined in every particular being, though not permanently, but temporally only.

But if the First Cause is of itself indeterminate, it cannot produce the forms by the putting on of which it shapes the universe and makes it pass from indeterminateness to determinateness. It is absolutely impossible to conceive of it as sufficient to the production of these effects. And yet such it must be if the principle holds that every effect must have a sufficient cause, the principle which serves as a basis for all philosophical and scientific inquiries. For, when is a cause sufficient, or, what is the same, when is it proportioned to the production of a given effect? Only when it pre-contains the latter's perfection either under the same or a higher

form. This is not a tenet blindly admitted or postulated by ancient philosophy ; it is an undeniable axiom of reason, adopted also by science and confirmed by experience. The impulse given by a mechanical power is not and cannot be stronger than the power itself ; the motion communicated is not faster than that of the body communicating it ; living beings do not perform functions belonging to an order higher than their own ; parents do not beget offspring that is of a kind superior to themselves.

This axiom being borne in mind, it becomes evident that the First Cause, if it be indeterminate, cannot produce the forms of existence by which it is itself determined and the universe reduced to shape. For being unformed, it excludes all forms, and being indeterminate, it contains no determination. Nor can it be enriched or impregnated from without, for, being first, it is the source of all other beings. Should the First Cause, though indeterminate, by determining itself determine the things existing, as the evolutionists think it does, it would be necessary that whilst it is altogether empty and formless, it emits the infinite variety of forms which delight our eyes, and educes out of itself all the grandeur and beauty of the universe, all the peculiar natures of the organic as well as the inorganic world, the culture and peculiar energy of the human mind, the organization of society, the course of all the events which make up the history of mankind. Could any process be more absurd, more contradictory to all the laws of reason, and to the law especially that demands a sufficient cause for every effect ?

This is, however, only the first of the many contradictions implied in the idea of evolution. At the same time that the First Cause is assumed to be indeterminate, because immanent, it is to be considered as completely determinate by its own essence for the reason that it is self-existent. As self-existent, indeed, it must be conceived of ; for were it brought into existence by some other cause, it would no longer be first and absolutely independent. But that self-existence implies full and necessary determinateness is easily understood.

Whatever exists is individual and has its peculiar properties and degree of perfection. There exists no general being which is identical with things differing among themselves. There is no being that is not either rational or irrational, living or not living ; no animal that is neither of this nor of that size and shape, neither of the one nor of the other kind ; no plant that does not range under some species or does not require for its development certain conditions and has not certain potentialities. Existence necessarily implies determinateness.

The determinateness peculiar to the self-existent being results

from its essence. If whatever exists is necessarily determinate, the self-existent, having existence by reason of its own essence, has by it also its determinateness; and this determinateness, being essential, is of absolute necessity. The properties and perfections implied in an essence can never be wanting in the being constituted by it. A man can never be without reason, nor a body without matter, reason and matter being included in the essence of man and of body. Consequently the self-existent can never be divested of any determinant involved in its essence. Nor can perfection and properties accrue to it which determine it in a new manner. For, since to be determinate or to be differentiated means to exist so and not to exist otherwise, the essence which gives a being determinateness of one kind excludes from it determinateness of any other kind. By reason, therefore, of its essence the self-existent is so determined that it cannot in any way be determined differently, so constituted in a certain degree of perfection that any other degree is absolutely repugnant to it.

Hence it follows that full and complete determinateness is a necessary attribute of the self-existent. For what being is more completely determined than that which cannot be otherwise than it is, which with absolute necessity excludes any properties different from those which it actually has? And we must furthermore infer that determinateness does not come to it by complements added, nor by forms put on, but is intrinsic to its very being.

Thus determined, the self-existent cannot possibly pass from indeterminateness to determinateness. This is plain at first sight, and it becomes still plainer on attentive reflection. Owing to its full and essential determinateness, the self-existent is clothed with attributes which are necessarily opposed to growth in being.

The self-existent is without any potentiality. For, being determinate by its own essence, it cannot be stripped of any of its perfections, nor can it acquire any new perfection or perfection in a new degree. It is, therefore, always in complete actuality. We cannot even distinguish in it anything that receives and perfection that is received. It is all perfection. Hence it must be conceived as of pure actuality.¹

Then, if the self-existent is without any potentiality owing to its essential determinateness, there is in it no distinction between possibility and actuality, between essence and existence, between the subject that is and its nature. It is consequently being itself, self-subsisting, unreceived, and completely actual.²

Furthermore, the self-existent is infinite, that is, possessing all

¹ S. Thomas, *Sum. c. gent.*, lib. i., c. 16.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 21 and 22.

pure perfections in the highest possible degree; by pure perfections those being understood which are unalloyed with any imperfection. Being determined of itself, as it is existent of itself, it actually has all perfections agreeing with, and excludes only those repugnant to, its essence. Now there is no intrinsic repugnance between self existence and infinity; on the contrary, the possession of all perfection in the highest degree must be conceived as intrinsically possible, because it does not imply being and not being, affirmation and negation, and as possible in the self-existent alone, because dependence in being is an imperfection. Moreover, the self-existent, being free from all potentiality, is Being itself, Being unreceived, and hence not restricted by any subject in which it is received, nor limited by any cause by which it is produced. But, what is comprised in Being? All perfections in their highest degree; for every perfection is being, and only the fulness of them is equal to the fulness of being. Accordingly, the self-existent is perfection unlimited.¹

Again, the self-existent being is absolutely simple. Composition is irreconcilable with its complete actuality, its infinity, and its necessity. Component parts do not imply one another's reality, but only the possibility of being united; nor do they contain the perfection of the whole which they constitute; they only concur in forming it by mutual union. Every part, therefore, is finite and involves potentiality. And such is also the whole formed of them. It has been reduced from potentiality to actuality, and, therefore, may or may not exist, may or may not have perfection and completeness. It is necessarily, also, finite; for, of finite parts the infinite cannot be made.²

Lastly, the self-existent is absolutely unchangeable. This attribute is an obvious consequence of necessary and essential determinateness. Besides, changeableness presupposes in the being changed incompleteness and potentiality—for, how else could transition from one state to another be possible?—and, it moreover implies distinction and at the same time composition between a substratum which persists, and of forms which in it succeed one another. The self-existent, therefore, being absolutely simple and purely actual, is not susceptible of any change.³

In a word, the self-existent being is the sum and height of all perfection, not of such as is limited, or received, or implies division and composition, but of that which is pure, unlimited, unreceived, and altogether simple. It is the ocean containing all being, which cannot decrease or increase, because all is in it, and all is essential to it; an ocean without shores, boundless in extent

¹ *Ibid*, p. 28.

² *Ibid.*, cap. 18.

³ S. Thom., *Sum. Theol.*, i., qu. 9, art. 1.

and eternal in duration, subject to no change, but always tranquil, and yet, though unchanged, most manifold in grandeur and beauty, and though manifold, yet absolutely one and indivisible. The self-existent is above this finite and unstable world. It is the source of changeable beings, but is itself unchangeable; it is the cause of finite existences, but is itself infinite in perfection, comprising all that is great and beautiful without any limit, and without any shadow of imperfection. It is the source of all life we admire in this universe, but, being unreceived, it is life itself, the most perfect life, hence not matter, but spirit, intelligence and wisdom, beauty and holiness itself.

The nature of the self-existent, as thus described, shuts out advancement from indeterminateness to determinateness as necessarily as light shuts out darkness. Growing in perfection, in determinateness, in complexity, in heterogeneity, is perpetual change; presupposes finiteness and incompleteness, distinction and composition between a substratum and forms, which successively determine it all attributes which we have seen to be directly repugnant to the nature of the self-existent.

The being which is evolved, which passes from lower to higher stages, from the indeterminate to the determinate, is never fully actual and complete, but always remains imperfect; it is not above the vicissitudes we experience, but is identical with the world that ever changes; it does not resemble the boundless, ever-tranquil ocean, but rather a river, which, running down a mountain slope, always increases from unknown sources, yet never reaches the sea to find its rest; it is not the fulness of Being unlimited and indivisible, but only a small portion of being, limited, and consisting of component parts; not life, perfection, and beauty unreceived and self-subsisting, but some degree of life and perfection received, and constantly dying away.

To sum up the conclusions arrived at: the general idea of evolution, if carefully analyzed, proves to be a labyrinth of incongruities. As represented by it, the First Cause is clothed with contradictory attributes. As immanent in the ever-changing and developing world, this cause is indeterminate; as self-existing, it is fully determinate. In consequence, all its properties are set in opposition to one another. Inasmuch as it is indeterminate, it is imperfect, finite, compound, and changeable; inasmuch as it is self-existent, it is supremely perfect, infinite, simple, and absolutely unchangeable. To enhance yet more the contradiction, every one of its attributes is essentially inconsistent with transition from indeterminateness to determinateness. If indeterminate, the First Cause cannot, by its activity, develop from itself the forms by which it is determined; if fully determinate by its own essence, it

cannot undergo a change by which it gradually proceeds from a lower to a higher degree of determinateness.

Ideas which consist of contradictory elements express absolute impossibilities. This is an axiom the denial of which would land us in universal skepticism. Consequently, evolution, as expounded by modern philosophers, is absolutely and intrinsically impossible, and it will always remain such, whatever theories may be adopted to make it good, and whatever praises may be lavished on it to recommend it to the public.

From this summary conclusion two important corollaries have yet to be deduced. If the self-existent being cannot consistently be conceived of as immanent in the things transformed, if it is unproduced, infinite, absolutely simple and unchangeable, whilst all earthly existence is produced, finite, compound, and ever-changing, then, indeed, the First Cause is supramundane, distinct from this visible world, superior to it in power, higher in perfection, anterior in duration, infinitely above it in nature and existence. If, furthermore, the First Cause is the source of all being, and yet could not give origin to the finite beings by immanent evolution, it undoubtedly has produced them by a transitive action; and, since the first and self-existent being is absolutely simple, this transitive action cannot but be creation or production out of nothing.

Such are the truths revealed by the simple analysis of the idea of evolution. They may be admitted but reluctantly, or rejected indignantly, but they are as clear as daylight.

THE NEWEST RITUALISM IN ENGLAND.

SO rapid has been the spread of more or less "High Church" doctrines and practices in England during the last ten or twelve years, that it is now the rule, rather than the exception, among Anglicans to be in some sort of this tendency, and to belong to one or another shade in the almost infinite prism of what they call Anglo-Catholic opinion. Throughout country and city evidences of the prevailing tone abound. In the churches it is the usual custom to have a cross on the communion-table, flanked by candles and vases of flowers; and not the wildest Orangeman in the whole Church Association would dream of trying to prosecute a clergyman for the use of such ornaments now. The Association still exists and lectures, but its palmy days of persecution and triumph are over, and even the bishops of its own party have withdrawn from it much of the ægis of their protection.¹ Practices are accepted as usual which not very long ago were looked on as implying "Extreme Views"; while Ritualists who formerly contented themselves with modest manifestations, have now burst out into the fullest blaze of vestments, banners, and incense. The whole standpoint of the Church of England is higher than formerly. This does not imply that Anglicans are more united; for the forty or fifty gradations of Ritualism and high churchism and broad churchism causes plenty of heart-burning and inward dissatisfaction even now.

But it seems as if the higher gradations, the "Extreme Views," were carrying the day, even if they have not carried it already. This, at least, is what we gather from Archdeacon Farrar's bitter farewell article in the "Review of the Churches," the editorship of which periodical he has lately resigned. Archdeacon Farrar is a man who has been generally considered High Church. At one time he won applause even from the Ritualists, when he heroically demanded that a founder should step forward (like a Benedict, a Francis, or an Ignatius) to establish a great religious order in the Anglican Church; but no St. Benedict was forthcoming, and the Catholic papers rather satirically asked why Canon Farrar should not be the founder himself? But if he has ever pleased the Ritu-

¹ For instance, the evangelical Bishop Ryle, of Liverpool, raised objections to the delivery of a Church Association lecture in a place where extreme Ritualism prevailed, on the ground that charity would not be served thereby, and that he disapproved of clergymen holding meetings in another clergyman's parish without his sanction.

alists, it has been by fits and starts, for he is Protestant to the core, and recognizes Protestantism as the parent and only possible standpoint of the Anglican Church. Of his successor in the editorial chair he writes that "he has the courage of his convictions, and is not going to swerve or bow before the tyranny, the sneers, the calumnies, the incessant and systematic depreciation which they must expect to undergo at the hands of the dominant majority, who dare to combat and to repudiate their baseless claim to infallibility; and their open hostility to the distinctive doctrines of 'the bright and blissful Reformation,'" etc.! "By a sort of vaunting convention," the angry Archdeacon continues, "which has already deceived the ignorant, no one is supposed to do any work but Ritualists. . . . The whole cause of the Reformation is going by default; and if the alienated laity, who have been driven into indifference¹ by Romish innovations and Romish doctrines forced upon them without any voice of theirs in the matter, do not wake in time, and assert their rights as sharers in the common and sole priesthood of all Christians, they will awake too late, to find themselves nominal members of a church which has become widely Popish in all but name—a church in which Catholicity is every day being made more and more synonymous with stark Romanism, and in which the once honored name of Protestant is overwhelmed with calumny and insult." The honored name of Protestant! This and the rest of the Archdeacon's remarks, coming from a light of the Anglican Church, must have been a bitter draught to the Ritualists, though they have shelved the difficulty by taking little or no notice of his article. His Protestant zeal has apparently not been at all placated by their habitual abuse of Rome, which in the case of their less refined organs is every whit as railing as his own. He sees only their ever increasing imitation of Roman practices; their "baseless claim to infallibility," at which real Catholics are rather inclined to laugh good-naturedly; and the growing numbers which make them already a "dominant majority" in the Church of England.

But although the incessant warfare of the last thirty years has placed Ritualism in the ascendant, and in spite of the strong tendency of religious minds in England at the present day towards a religion which seems to bring them nearer to our Divine Lord, to His Saints and angels and all holy things, yet it must not be supposed that what is called by a contradiction in terms the Anglo-Catholic party finds its path smooth or its throne easy. The lack of authority and obedience compasses it round with vexations—trials from the "other branches" that do not believe in it—

¹ The Archdeacon is surely wrong here. The laity who have any religion at all generally accept it from the High Church party.

trials from its own brethren who stop half or three-quarters of the way up the Ritualistic ladder. All sorts of miseries arise from this last cause. When advanced Anglicans find themselves in a new place, their first care is to discover "what kind of a church there is," and to what gradation of opinion the rector or vicar belongs. They know that anything is possible, but the probabilities may be broadly classed as three. A brief inspection of the Church and the notice-board is enough to enlighten the anxious inquirer as to whether the Church is "quite low" or quasi-Calvinistic (a rare thing now, fashion setting strongly against Calvinism), or whether it produces that even more exasperating, because more unmeaning, phrase, the "moderate hearty service"; or whether the clergy really hold "Catholic views." In the first case, the interior is cold and bare, and the notices will announce the hours of morning and evening prayer on Sundays, with the Lord's supper after the services on the first Sunday of the month; and the outraged Ritualist turns away with indignation, only congratulating himself that even the bishops are turning against that sort of thing now. In the second case, there is perhaps a cross behind the communion-table, and there may be vases of flowers, but no candles; all other desired symbols are absent, the tendency is towards mid-day non fasting communions, and one feels sure that "Anglican chants are used," and that the sermons avoid "all contraverted points"; in short, that the "moderate hearty service" means "*vox et præterea nihil*." But in the last and most welcome case, a variety of functions, "Early Eucharist," choral celebration (sometimes boldly called High Mass), daily matins, "spiritual consultations after evensong on Fridays and Saturdays," etc., are announced by the notices, while the chancel glows with flowers and the ecclesiastical color of the season, the stations of the Cross adorn the walls, and a florid and exuberantly incorrect imitation of the ornamentation of real Catholic Churches prevails. Of late a craze for lamps has broken out; a specimen of the whole spirit of Ritualism—a symbolism with nothing to symbolize. Their inspection of Catholic Churches has shown the good inquisitive Ritualists, ever on the search for new ideas: 1, that we always burn a lamp; 2, that in the larger churches there are often three or more lamps before one of the altars, and occasionally a smaller one before some other less richly adorned shrine. Forthwith they hang up seven lamps before their "High Altar," and three before the side altar which they are so proud of possessing (its existence is often announced in the advertisements); and there the lamps burn away solemnly—in honor of nothing! The outward visible sign is there, mendaciously assertive, but the inward spiritual grace is wanting.

In some churches, as in St. Alban's, Holborn, the travesty is so complete as to deceive, if it were possible, even the elect, and to make a stranger believe himself to be in a Catholic Church. It is said that occasionally Catholics, entering St. Alban's by mistake, have in all good faith imagined themselves to be hearing Mass, until some inaccuracy in the ritual, or the sound of an English word, caught their attention and drove them headlong from the precincts. But, as a general rule, there is much in the Ritualistic churches which would show a Catholic at once that he was not in his "Father's House." Almost always the tabernacle is absent, the bishops having so steadily set their faces against a direct practical contradiction of the Article which condemns reservation, that but few incumbents venture on this extreme step. The confessionals are often disguised by an ornamentation not usually considered symbolic of the Sacrament of Penance; a sort of rockery, with flowers growing in it, will conceal the penitential spot in one church, a curtain hanging over a nook under the organ in another. In very few churches is an hour for confessions boldly and openly stated on the notice-board. "The clergy will be here for spiritual conference," or, "Those who wish for spiritual conversation with the clergy can apply after Evensong,"—such paraphrases as these express the willingness of vicar and curates to exercise that function which above all they secretly aspire to discharge—the function of remission of sins; and to rush in where angels fear to tread, among the delicate and extraordinary complications of the human conscience.

Tentativeness, doubts, dissensions, gropings, compromises, make up a great part of the life of Ritualism even in these its comparatively triumphant days. Though it may "claim to be infallible," it cannot itself make up its mind as to what subjects it is bound to be infallible upon. The most uncomfortable doubts and apprehensions as to possible opinions on vital points run through the curious advertisement columns of the Ritualistic newspapers, though none of the stipulations and conditions are more really strange than the common one inserted by rectors advertising for a curate, that he must be "Catholic." But this in itself has broad meanings, though it always be taken to include a belief in the Real Presence and the advisability of confession, and generally a willingness to wear copes and chasubles in or out of season, and to practice that tentative kind of prayer for the dead which is approved by the Ritualistic clergy, whose ideas of a middle state for the departed are of the vaguest description. Following the word "Catholic" are announcements and conditions only intelligible to the initiated, as "E. P." Stipulations which would sound strangely in the Catholic ear appear; as "E. P.," or the Eastward Position,

or "Six Points," sometimes reduced to only five in the case of incumbents who pique themselves on not going too far, and who leave one wondering whether they are willing to do without wafer bread, or the mixed chalice, or altar lights, or vestments, or incense; or whether the eastward position, so long fought for, may be given up after all. Here and there comes in an ominous and unsatisfactory announcement of "Not extreme," or "Moderate views," or "Thorough Churchman," or "Moderate High," all implying the most painful vagueness and rampant ascendancy of private opinion. Where but in an Anglican Church newspaper would one find three such advertisements as the following in the same column? "Wanted, Priest, Catholic; six points. Daily celebration and evensong." "Experienced Priest, Catholic; Ritualistic minutiae not desired." "Wanted as Curates Clergymen of Evangelical Church Views, gentle manners, and some ability in desk and pulpit." Could anything be more unconsciously satirical than the reference to Ritualistic minutiae? And do not the Evangelical Church views, and the reference to desk and pulpit, smack of a very old order of things, which has no attraction at all for the young and ardent spirits who want to Catholicize the Church of England? And, again, what sort of a church can that be which requires Catholicizing?

The spirit which makes all this possible among Anglicans is quite incomprehensible to a Catholic, unless he also take into account the Anglican habit of mind, and the training which teaches that error is compatible with a Divine mission to teach, and visible division with essential unity. This fallacy, which so curiously leaves private judgment practically free while it supposes the acceptance of Catholic doctrine and ritual in general, and opens the way for every vagary and caprice of the clerical fancy, has been the origin of all those curiously made up services, fancy monastic costumes, and selections of teachings from the Fathers, which have surrounded Ritualism with an ever-varying and sensational brilliancy.

And yet here, as in so much else which partakes of man's wilful, natural childishness,

"There's a divinity that shapes our ends,
Rough-hew them how we will";

and an influence, we may well believe, is governing the course of Ritualism, of which the Ritualists themselves are little aware. So rapidly is the new movement devouring the dull, uninteresting old Protestant sects, so great an attraction has it for the cultured classes, so hopefully is it beginning to shake up the long dormant religious instinct even in the poorer classes, who so long held aloof

from distinct doctrinal and sacramental teaching, that it is changing the face of what at the beginning of the century was a three-quarters indifferent, one-quarter Methodist country. There are not wanting prophets who prophesy that it will please God to lead back the English to His Church even through these strange ways of their own choosing, since they chose them not in wilful blindness, but in the desire to draw nearer to Him.

Four ways at least can be distinctly pointed out in which Ritualists are doing a direct good to souls, and preparing them to receive the whispers of that very grace of conversion to the One Church against which their leaders vociferously strive :

1. They have made indisputably valid baptism the rule in England, instead of the exception as it formerly was, and thus we have to do with a nation composed in great part of real members of Christ's Church.
2. They have introduced the Act of Contrition, so that in the case of really earnest and practising Anglicans we have to do with souls in the state of grace.
3. They are remarkable for conscientious discharge of duties, and for a warm and deep and personal love of our Divine Lord.
4. They are familiarizing the minds of the people with the idea of Sacraments, and of the beauty of holiness.

No doubt some will be tempted to exclaim, "But it is all a gigantic sham!" And so, materially speaking, it is; but Ritualism is by no means formally a sham in the consciences of most of the Ritualists. The born Catholic is apt to bring these accusations because he does not know what it is to have been bred outside the Church and to have imbibed prejudices against Catholicism among the earliest lessons of life. He knows not how deeply a Protestant education has rooted in the soul the predominant idea that of all things on earth the Church of Rome is the one to be most carefully avoided, or how closely the father of lies has contrived to wind that chosen fallacy of his around the hearts of the children of the Reformation. The born extern gradually comes to think that Sacraments are sweet and ceremonies beautiful, that the priesthood is the glorious mirror of Christ, confession balm to the soul, and Holy Communion its paradise; only he shrinks from seeking these things in what he has been told is a foreign and corrupt Communion; let him have them in his own church, that he may not be forced to go suing for them to the gates of Rome. To satisfy this demand, an immense supply has arisen—a supply of mock priests, mock Sacraments, mock ceremonies; a supply of flowers, banners, lamps, and vestments; and with these, for the present, many souls profess themselves satisfied. They seem to have no reasoning powers on this one subject. Logic is set aside. The unity and Catholicity of the Church of Christ, their own isolation,

their internecine divisions, the thousand discrepancies which mark their church as a human affair and ever so clumsy a one, these things are blinked and set on one side, while they bask in the blaze of a gorgeous ceremony or listen to the strident claims of their leaders. The most brazen assertions are made in the hope of linking Anglicanism to the universal Church—I had well-nigh said the most brazen lies, but this would be in itself an assertion contrary to truth as well as to charity. No doubt the lies are material, but those who utter them have nearly always, if not quite always, convinced themselves of their own sincerity. It has often been said of Anglicans by Catholics that the laity are sincere, but that the clergy, who lead the laity, and direct them, and tyrannize over them, and keep them out of the Church of God, are in wilful error—are, in fact, selling their birthright and the birthright of others for the mess of pottage which the Establishment provides. But, like most sweeping condemnations, this one requires to be modified. Cardinal Newman's "Apologia" has shown in the most perfectly historical manner how one of the truest, and noblest, and purest souls that ever lived could innocently, and even conscientiously, deceive itself for many years, fearing to offend God by leaving the Church of England, even when the discrepancies and persecutions of that Church had made communion with it intolerable and well-nigh impossible. In like manner can many a clerical convert of later years give an account of the thousand influences which held him back—the sight of well-doing in his own Church, the fallacies plausibly painted up to look convincing, the example of men of good lives who have yet finished their course within the elastic pale of Anglicanism, and the strange illogical proposition, which has misled so many, that it is a man's duty to stay where he was born and bred. That conscience becomes strangely but inculpably false which has been led to look on the thought of leaving the Church of England as a thought mortally sinful, and only God can judge of the amount of its guilt, if any, in putting that thought away.

No doubt many a poor soul is glad to think that its duty lies in the old familiar paths. Those paths are smoother than they were in Newman's Anglican days. The "Catholic Revival," as its disciples fondly call it, has progressed since that time, and has enlarged its borders, and victoriously swept within them almost the whole of the cultured classes who are practically Christians at all. The very bishops, who gave so much trouble in former times, when they "freely handselled their Apostolic weapons in the Apostolic party," have been partially converted by their flocks. One of them, the Bishop of Lincoln, is a sincere and thorough Ritualist, an enormous gain to a party which for many years had not a single

prelate on its side; and Dr. Benson's judgment on Dr. King's proceedings was so carefully framed as to please the High Church party rather than the other, though His Grace did not succeed in trimming his sails so as quite to catch either of the conflicting currents, and though the absurdly undefined character of Anglican doctrine and Ritual was quite remarkably emphasized by his so-called decision.¹ The Bishop of London, who, when first consecrated to the See of Exeter was considered by the devout almost too "Broad" to live, to say nothing of becoming a bishop, has lately maintained the Reredos at St. Paul's against all Orangedom and allows the whole cathedral to assume a more and more Catholic appearance, though his "broadness" still remains, causing him occasionally to preside at French Huguenot services. The identical Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, who, fifteen years ago, closed St. Raphael's, Bristol, on Ritualistic counts, has now reinstated its incumbent, and disports himself in his own cathedral in cope and mitre. And if straws show which way the wind blows, so the attitude of the Anglican bishops indicates the current of public religious opinion. Ritualism is the fashion. It is also in the glow of its first fervors, a brand new thing, a fascinating idea; people point triumphantly to the amount of work accomplished by its clergy, forgetting that they are working in the first *clan* and heyday of an entirely new religion. Thus even Buddhism came out beautiful and ardent from the brain of Siddâtha, and Buddhist monks accomplished the acts and practiced the virtues of veritable saints. Spiritual activity is fascinating and entrancing because of its apparent wholesomeness and its freedom from the sin and selfishness which canker worldly efforts. It abounds in the High Church clergy and pious laity. Services are incessant; the most self-denying works are undertaken for all classes of the poor and friend-

¹ The *Guardian*, by far the most cultured and high-toned of all the Anglican papers, contained the following paragraph in its issue of March 1, 1893: "When the clergy who have signed the declaration about the Lincoln judgment say that the legalized toleration of a variety of ritual in the administration of the Holy Communion will prove a serious evil, we do not greatly differ from them. We have never recommended such toleration as a thing good in itself, but simply as the best thing attainable in the existing circumstances of the Church of England. Have the signatories of this document . . . considered what would be the effect of an opposite policy, of the imposition; that is, of either of the types of ritual now in use in the Church of England upon all the clergy alike? The Church Association has endeavored to do this from its own point of view; we know with what result. Is there any reason to think that if a similar attempt was made from the opposite side it would be any the more effectual? While men's minds are in their present state the only possible consequence of such attempts . . . would be disruption, etc." How entirely falsified, on the one subject of the Christian faith, must the consciences of our otherwise good and devout Anglican friends be, when, in the face of such a confession this, they can still adhere to the Church of England!

less ; guilds and confraternities spring up in every parish ; books and periodicals are poured forth from the doctrinal press ; shelters and free dinners and clothing depôts are established by the energetic and self-sacrificing sisters.¹ One thing only is wanting, the spirit of obedience binding the work together, and perpetuating it as only obedience can. And it is the want of this spirit which betrays the Ritualist into those incongruities, those uncertain flounderings and self-contradictory manifestations whereby their zeal is in some sort discredited and coupled with a sense of the ridiculous.

One of the most deplorable of the Ritualistic peculiarities is undoubtedly the spite, the envy, hatred, and malice, with which a certain section of the party regard that Catholic Church whose name they usurp. Their accusations against her, their assertions that she has erred and contradicted herself (to prove which fact they would move mountains, if they could) would suffice if believed, to condemn Christianity itself as a mere myth, and to show the Divine promises as having failed in every particular. The Ritualists do not mean this ; it is the logical outcome of their doctrine, but they never follow a proposition so far as its last conclusion ; to do so would be to destroy their system altogether. Their very contention that "the Church consists of all Christians who have real sacraments" is a most unfortunate one for them who are face to face with the standing misery of numbers of their own clergy still disbelieving the necessity of any sacraments at all, to say nothing of the validity of their orders being denied by Christendom in general.

Poor souls ! They are always heaving this question of the orders uphill, like the stone of Sisyphus, only to see it roll back into the valley of endless uncertainties, and to tread forever the same interminable ascent. Deeply as they may hate Rome, they have no keener ambition than to show that she, or some one connected with her, has in some round-about way recognized their succession. They have produced a book which "begs the question in its very title of '*Rome's Tribute to Anglican Orders*,'" and which, on the ground of a few accidents and misinterpretations in foreign parts,²

¹ A community of these, established at Kilburn, London, N. W., has made itself quite famous in the metropolis for its good works. It has an orphanage, day-schools, several depôts where the poor can buy decent clothing at nominal prices ; it dispenses good meals to starving children, and sends food-trucks into the poorest parts of the town where working-men congregate ; a whole page might be filled with a list of its charities.

² On the Continent generally, but especially in its more secluded corners, but little is known of Anglican pretensions to Catholicity and priesthood, and the request to "say Mass" of enterprising clerical tourists has sometimes been allowed by careless sacristans under the impression that the said clerics were like the United Greeks or the

claims the recognition of Rome for their succession in the face of her unconditional re-ordination of their clergy. As this book, though trivial enough in itself, is misleading souls, it was made the subject of a lecture and disproved from cover to cover by Father Breen, O. S. B., at Archbishop's House, Westminster, on the occasion of a meeting of the Historical Research Society. This society, instituted by Cardinal Vaughan for the purpose of giving free lectures and encouraging subsequent discussion, may do much towards throwing down the two pillars of ignorance and sophistry on which modern Protestantism rests.

"But," some outsider will exclaim, "as the Ritualists can only have derived their orders from Rome, they are naturally anxious to think that she acknowledges them." He is mistaken. The advance party maintain that they derive their orders from the old English Church, with which their own is continuous. Simple persons were accustomed to think that the old English Church was Roman Catholic, and the world in general thinks so now. But the Ritualist knows better. Continuity is his present craze, and there is no laughable misinterpretation, no maniacal self-contradiction to which he will not have recourse to prove it. In his mouth continuity is a word that has no meaning, for it must consist in something, and where is that something? Here, again, I must have recourse to Father Breen, who has done so much for Catholic controversy, and whose learning is emphasized by the quiet and self-contained style of his speech and writing. In a letter to the *Leeds Mercury* the reverend Benedictine wrote thus trenchantly and to the point: "To continue means to remain the same." . . . In order to prove the religious continuity of the post-Reformation Church with the pre-Reformation it must be shown that (1) its constitution, (2) its creed, (3) its discipline remains the same as it was before. You must prove that the constitution of a Church which accepts the Royal supremacy as its *raison d'être* remains the same as the constitution of a Church which held the Papal supremacy to be the divinely instituted principle of all Church government. You must prove that a creed which holds the sacrifice of the Mass to be a "blasphemous fable and dangerous deceit" remained the same with a creed which held the Mass to be the highest act of Christian worship. You have to prove that the discipline of a Church which

Maronites, having a liturgy of their own, though in communion with the Holy See. Such a case occurred some years ago in a town in the south of Italy, where two clergymen "said Mass in English," with each other for servers, at the tomb of one of the Apostles. The fraud was discovered some weeks later by a real English priest on his being asked by the Sacristan whether he would say the Latin Mass or use his own missal.

allows the marriage of the clergy remains the same with that which forbade it."

These sentences put the case in a nutshell; but even now the Ritualist will go on striving against facts, proving black white and the unreal real; he will tell you in the face of every mediæval ecclesiastical record that the old Church of England did not acknowledge Papal supremacy, that ancient Saxon Church discipline permitted clerical marriage, and so on *ad infinitum*. As to the Articles, though he cannot deny that the Church of England invented them in a Calvinistic spirit, he still maintains that they do not bind the Church of England, nor express her true mind; and that nobody who signs them is expected to believe in them, an evasion and mental reservation which would be very hardly dealt with if it were the condition of Catholic ordinations. The "perfect flower" of this jealous hatred of Rome lately blossomed in *The Parish Magazine*, a periodical published in London, and localized in various parishes, and has been going the round of the Catholic papers to the no small amusement of their readers. A beneficed clergyman of the Church of England is responsible for this manifestation. He says: "The oldest Non-conformist to-day in the kingdom cannot claim to be more than three hundred years old, while the present Roman mission and body in England are of far more recent origin, dating only from 1850, the year in which they were founded by Pope Pius IX. Neither this Roman hierarchy . . . nor its mission have any connection whatever with the past history of the English Church and nation," etc. The amazing effrontery of this assertion contrasts oddly with the calmly historic assertion on another page of the same magazine: "In the days when Roman Catholicism was dominant in our land, ministers were as numerous as they are now scarce," etc. In fact, the new pretension that England was never a Roman Catholic country is too extravagant to be maintained consistently even in the very publications where it is advanced. It is in itself the very newest doctrine of one of our newest sects. They certainly make the most heroic efforts to live up to it. They calmly write as if they positively had nothing to do with Latimer and Cranmer and Barlow and Henry VIII., who severed England from Catholic unity, and burned and starved the monks and seized the revenues of the monasteries, but rather as if they were one with the Church which was persecuted, though they know that the heads and faithful members of that Church suffered death and imprisonment rather than deny that supremacy of Peter, which they, with Henry VIII., repudiate. They have recently sent to Malling, in Sussex, exactly as many mock Benedictine nuns as the king expelled real ones from that foundation at the time of the suppression of monasteries,

and the High Church papers jubilantly recall the fact. Well might a convert from Anglicanism lately remark that it might be said to the Ritualists, as our Lord said to the Jews, "Your fathers killed the prophets and you build them sepulchres."

But the strangest self-contradiction in the whole medley of self-contradictions is the fact that in the face of the endlessly repeated assertions of continuity with the old English Church, a half-concealed but very real movement has been on foot for several years past to import real orders into the Anglican Church.* It is an open secret, if a secret at all, that an Anglican clergyman sought reordination and consecration at the hands of a foreign sectarian bishop, and that he has subsequently reordained many of his fellow-clerics, thus entirely giving away the claim to continuity, since what need can there be of new orders if the Parkerite Succession, as preachers and Church papers spend all their breath in asserting, is one with the Succession of the Old English Church? The new hierarchy, who exist and act *sub rosa*, and, of course, without recognition by Drs. Benson and Thompson and their suffragans, are a living denial of the continuity theory; but at least they have the comfort, if any, of knowing that they possess real schismatic orders, and they, as Father Gallway, S. J., wrote of them in 1878, "galvanize into ghostly life" some portion of the English Establishment. But here, again, no one knows exactly what portion is being "galvanized." At one altar you may have a real priest, ordained, it is true, in and to rebellion against Peter, but still a priest, celebrating a real Mass and communicating with a Consecrated Host, while at another stands the mere parson, depending for his title to priesthood on Parker and Barlow and a line of unconsecrated and probably unbaptized prelates. At one death-bed the man whose orders are "not doubtful, but absolutely invalid," takes on himself to absolve the parting soul, at another a schismatic priest exercises the jurisdiction which the Church allows to him in that extreme hour. Full of uncertainties and of confusion as the Anglican Church has ever been, this alone was wanting to complete the misery of her state, that through a clandestine and lawless ordination real priesthood should be somewhere lurking within her bounds, though the communicant and the penitent know not exactly where. Certainly the Catholic was right who, in answer to the boast that the Anglican Church reverted to primitive times, admitted that it reverted to the most primitive time of all—the state of chaos!

It may well be asked how a movement so full of illusions as Ritualism, especially one marked so strongly with that hatred of the Church of God which is said to be essentially diabolic and not natural to the human heart, can be doing God's work? and how

it is that numbers of ritualists receive immense extra-sacramental grace from God, as is evidenced by their energy in works of mercy, their reverence for and devotion to holy things, their scrupulously well-ordered lives. The answer would be as multifold as are the varieties of spirits and opinions among our separated friends. For instance, not all are so bitter against the Catholic Church as the contributor to the *Parish Magazine*, just quoted, or as poor Dr. Littledale was, or as is the present editor of the *Church Times*. Some even of the clergy are respectful in their attitude towards the Church, look on her as at least an elder sister, have strange yearnings and leanings towards her which the far-fetched arguments of their brethren cannot dispel, sometimes say that they would submit to her if she would only compromise with them on one or two doctrines which they disapprove. Of course, it is a strange frame of mind which would submit to the Church when she should have pronounced herself mistaken; but this is only a relic of the Protestant tradition so deeply graven on the average English mind. Of the class of clergy who are "respectfully willing to compromise," many ultimately give up private judgment and enter the haven where they would be. As to the High Church laity, they are, as a rule, sincerely anxious to do what is right, are faithful to their pious practices and good works, and take their religion on faith from their preachers and directors. Some are such noble souls that one can only wonder how it is that they can live for another hour out of the Church of God. Of these is the President of the English Church Union, who seems to have always before his eyes a great ideal of what the Church should be, and, out of a mistaken idea of loyalty, to determine to think that such the Church of England is. Every word that he spoke in a recent address to the Union, concerning the position of dissenters, would have been absolutely true if said of Anglicans in relation to Catholicism. He talked of the grace which was undoubtedly given, to externs, but pointed out that although Almighty God is liberal beyond His own promises, those promises are attached to the Sacraments of the Church, to which, therefore, every one is bound to have recourse. Lord Halifax is himself an illustration of what grace can do outside its regular channels, but his eyes are still closed to the fact that he is himself an extern, and that he cannot expect dissenters to recognize the mission of the poor blundering Anglican sect, while he is blind to the presence of the sublime Church of God, the one divinely appointed Ark of Salvation! But it may be added that the noble President of the E. C. U. has never condescended to the vulgar abuse of the Church so common in the rank and file of his party; on the contrary, he has always protested against it as an outrage on religion and common sense.

If, as many Catholics think and hope, Ritualism shall prove a chief means of the conversion of England, the occasion would not be the first on which the enemy of souls has been made to frustrate his own ends. People wanted sacraments and the beauty of holiness, and he has given them an imitation in the hope, always so dear to his heart, of perpetuating a heresy ; for he is a cynic, and loves nothing so much as a religious fraud. But presently men of good-will must find out the deceit and demand the real jewel of which they have been robbed so long.

One would prefer to look on the Ritualists rather as children playing at holy functions than as wilful impostors or heretics. Wilful heresy, as Newman, with his wide range of knowledge, always maintained, is so rare as to be almost non-existent among Protestants born and bred. If a few of the Ritualists—let us say a noisy minority—rail against the Church of God, their irritation is the natural result of the conscious insecurity of their position. The eternal presence of the Catholic Church is an argument that cannot be answered ; abuse is the only resource, and some allowance must be made for men harassed by the double battle against their own clergy of other views on the one hand and the galling indifference of an amused Christendom on the other. The gentler sort among these poor storm-tossed souls are praying for heavenly guidance out of their difficulties, and are turning their eyes to her “who has dispersed all heresies throughout the entire world.” The rosary is in constant use with large numbers of them, and a most pathetic hymn to Our Lady, asking for guidance into “The Land of Rest,” has had a place for some time past in certain Ritualistic books of devotion. The way is hard before these noble, striving souls ; may they be able to sing one day, in the words of the “Martyr’s Song:”

“At His word, Who hath brought us hither,
The Red Sea must part hither and thither.”

May the waters of tribulation make a wall on the right hand and on the left when Israel comes out of Egypt and takes possession of the Promised Land.

A. W. GRANGE.

THE CLUNIAC AND HIS SONG.

Never did Poesy appear
So full of heaven to me

—LOWELL.

THE above caption has been made as vague and general as possible, not for the sake of bewildering the "gentle reader," but of warning him beforehand that he must expect little information of any kind—authentic or otherwise—of the Cluniac. But we shall have more to say of the song than of the singer, and we can therefore modestly congratulate ourselves on the aptness of our text. For while it is itself the thought of a singer,—our greatest American poet—it presents to us, as every text should, a compendium which shall be nothing less than a crystallization of our after-thoughts. And, indeed, while we know little more of the monk of Cluny than his name, Bernard, his poem, "so full of heaven," has been republished some half-a-dozen times; while extracts from it have been turned into English verse, with varying metre and varying success, about as often.

We have said that his poem is "full of heaven"; yet is not heaven his theme! He sings again the old, old song—older still than its utterance on the lips of Solomon, what time he saw, in all the pleasures of life, only "vanity of vanities." But while earth is the theme, heaven is the text; and in the singer's vision of the "Apocalyptical splendors," viler and viler becomes the *immundus mundus*.

Despite the vagueness of its title, it is the design of this paper to give what fragmentary account is possible of the Cluniac, and to attempt a translation into English of some verses of his wonderful poem.

Viewed from the standpoint of literary biography, Bernard of Morlaix, monk of Cluny, reproduces very strikingly many features of the life of Sedulius, the Poet of the Incarnate Word. The birth-place of each has been a matter of dispute. The student of hymnology need not be reminded that the latter poet has been claimed, at various times and by various biographers, for nearly every then civilized land under the sun,—for Ireland, Scotland, Rome, and Spain. So, too, Bernard has been assigned to Morlas in the lower Pyrenees and to Morlaix in Bretagne; while Pitseus makes him an Englishman,—"*natione anglus*." Neale harmonizes

these statements somewhat by having him "born at Morlaix, in Bretagne, but of English parents."

We meet also another element, not so much of fundamental uncertainty as of hasty error, common to both poets. For Sedulius, poet, of the fifth century, has been confounded by some writers with Sedulius, bishop, of the eighth, and another Sedulius, commentator of the Scriptures, of the ninth century; while our Bernard, the Carthusian, was a contemporary of the greater Bernard, the Cistercian; and Cluny and Clairvaux are familiar names. Indeed, unless a finger-post, pointing unerringly towards Cluny, were set up in this place, the casual reader might easily confound the one great poet with the other great poet,—the singer of the Celestial Country with the sweetest singer of the sweetest Name of Jesus!

It is also a curious coincidence, although hardly a possible source of confusion, that a certain monk of Clairvaux, a dear disciple of the saint, and himself *another* Bernard, who must have been familiarly known to ours of Cluny, should have figured so prominently in the story of the twelfth century of Christendom. The disciple became the master; and Eugenius III. left the peaceful obscurity of the cell to sit in the Chair of the Fisherman, and to rule with wisdom and fortitude the Church of God.

The lives of the two greater Bernards of Clairvaux, the disciple and the master, the pope and the saint, are written in the stirring history of their times. Turn we now to the third Bernard, our singer of Cluny, in whose humbler life the times do seem, if we read aright, to have written their sadder story.

Obscure in his birth-place, Bernard of Cluny is still more hidden by the ample walls of the monastery in whose contemplative silences his ear caught such sweet intimations of the celestial jubilees. "Monachus Cluniacensis"—Monk of Cluny—is the simple story of his life told in one of the earlier notices of him. That, though living in troublous times, he found shelter and peace in the midst of a religious fraternity, we may gather both from the fact that Peter, surnamed "the Venerable," was his abbot, and from the poetic visions he caught of a heaven that opes its sunlit vistas only to the dream-laden eyes of solitude. His sanctuary seems to have been invaded by none of the trying cares of ecclesiastical preferment; nevertheless, the humbler but hardly less incessant exactions of the priorate, to which conventual office he appears to have been raised, make us wonder at the private industry which could find opportunity sufficient for the completion of his *opus grande*. Perhaps, like the monk of Longfellow's "Legend Beautiful," he always found his heaven still waiting for him after the call of duty or charity had been answered. Certainly, his life

must have been a laborious one in many respects, if that notice, found in the Cluniac Chronicle, refers to our Bernard: Ipsius Petri Venerabilis tempore fuit Bernardus monachus prior Cluniacensis, totus religiosus, totus erga conventum laboriosus, et Ecclesiam Cluniacensem semper summa cum charitate amplectens. Quem ipse Petrus Venerabilis abbas Cluniacensis commendans epitaphium de ipso Bernardo tale quod sequitur descripsit.

“Egregius senior cui nil juvenile cohaesit,
Bernardus prior hac pausat humatus humo,
Hic post militiam coelestia castra subintrans,
Consenuit, certans hoc in agone diu.
Iste sibi pro te nunquam, Cluniace, pepercit,
Huic sibi nulla dies absque labore fuit.
Sic bene totius pondus tolerando diei,
Nummum promeritum sero reportat ovans.
Hujus, vos fratres, memores estote sepulti,
Nec cadat ex animo quod tegat ossa solum.”

Turning now from the man to the poem, we may console ourselves with the reflection of Carlyle, that “there is no heroic poem in the world but is at bottom a biography, the life of a man.” Time, which has hidden his personality, has brought to light his poetic life-work,—those three thousand Latin hexameter verses, classical in their preservation of the strict quantitative metre of the Augustan age; mediæval in the constant recurrence of rhyme and assonance; learned in their wealth of allusion, sometimes plain, sometimes recondite, but thoroughly scriptural; simple in their sudden bursts of enthusiastic longing, and in the continual reiteration of thoughts whose similarity shows us that the singer is pouring forth “strains of *unpremeditated* art.”

To understand the poem in its entirety, we must understand both the times and the man. But as it is our intention to present here the Latin text and a new English version of only a slight part of the poem, we need not enter upon any lengthy analysis of either the times or the man. We propose to translate merely the cento compiled by Trench from the Cluniac's description of the Heavenly Jerusalem. It was doubtless, as Neale says, to emphasize the miseries of earth that the poet commences his “bitter satire” with a glowing description of heaven. Neale gives this introduction great praise. To quote his words: “As a contrast to the misery and pollution of earth, the poem opens with a description of the peace and glory of heaven, of such rare beauty as not easily to be matched by any mediæval composition on the same subject.”

The opening lines of the poem, which we give here as a specimen of the difficulties encountered by the poet in his self-imposed task, do not find a place in the cento of Trench.

Hora novissima, || tempora pessima || sunt ; vigilemus !
 Ecce ! minaciter || imminet Arbiter || ille supremus.
 Imminet, imminet || ut mala terminet || aequa coronet,
 Recta remuneret || auxia liberet || aethera donet,
 Auferat aspera || duraque pondera || mentis onustae,
 Sobria muniat, || improba puniat, || utraque juste,
 Ille piissimus, || ille gravissimus || ecce ! venit Rex.
 Surgat homo reus ! || Instat homo Deus || , a Patre Juxta.

These are the only verses quoted by Simrock in his *Lauda Sion*. They are far from being the best, but will serve to introduce us into the frame of mind in which the singer began his task. The warning of the Apostle is ringing in his ears : " Little children, it is the last hour " (1 John, ii., 18). His metrical cast represents, therefore, not the dactylic expression of joy, but the resistless march of judgment. The impression commonly conveyed by the same metre in the verses which speak of the glories of Heaven is one of peaceful security. The real design of the poet—to awaken men's fears—would, however, rather lead us to suppose that he wished his majestic rhythms to inspire terror instead of joy ; and this view is further supported by the fact that only a comparatively small portion of the three thousand verses is given to what Trench aptly styles "*Laus Patriae Coelestis*." In truth, Heaven is placed in such charming colors before our eyes, only that earth may grow viler and viler. *De Contemptu Mundi* is the poet's own title to his own work.

The poetic or, rather, metrical and rhymic, restrictions with which the Cluniac hampered the free flow of emotion will be at once evident from a glance at the verses just quoted : while the strict quantitative prosody is observed throughout, the verses rhyme in pairs, and each contains, besides, two rhyming subdivisions. The metre is technically called Leonini Cristati Trilices Dactyllici. " It is," says Neale, " a dactylic hexameter, divided into three parts, between which a cæsure is inadmissible. The hexameter has a tailed rhyme, and feminine leonine rhyme between the first two clauses." Possibly some idea of the difficulties encountered by the poet might be given by an attempt to reproduce the metre (without, of course, the added difficulty of *quantitative* rhythm, which cannot be imitated in English, and can only be hinted at by *accent*) in the vernacular. We attempt the task thus :

Lo ! the last hour is here ; evillest power is here ; let us not slumber !
 Hither He hasteneth—in judgment chasteneth woes without number.
 Surely He cometh soon, the evil doometh soon, crowneth the holy !
 Granteth the guerdon then, beareth the burden then, lifteth the lowly !
 Lightens the weariness, brightens the dreariness, gives Heaven, our treasure ;
 Weakness admonisheth, wickedness punisheth, both in just measure.

Even without the added burden of *quantity*, the English lan-

guage yields itself so tardily to such restrictions of rhyme and metre that the graceful and painstaking translator, Dr. Neale, found it expedient to depart from his usual course of preserving as far as possible the original metres of the Latin hymns, and adopted an entirely dissimilar metrical form; "because," he explains, "our language, if it could be tortured to any distant resemblance of its rhythm, would utterly fail to give any idea of the majestic sweetness which invests it in the Latin." The Latin, with its long inflectional terminations, its richness in vowel sounds, its peculiar syntactic construction, admitting, with almost equal grace, the direct or the inverted style of phrasing, offers much less of an obstacle to leonine treatment. Nevertheless, to continue such treatment through the Virgilian length of three thousand lines was a task whose completion led Bernard to ascribe his success as much to the help of the Holy Spirit as to the industry and ingenuity of man. In his dedication of the poem to Peter the Venerable he distinctly asserts the necessity of such a help: "Often and of long time I had heard the Bridegroom, but had not listened to Him, saying, 'Thy voice is pleasant in Mine ears.' And again the Beloved cried out, 'Open to Me, My sister.' What then? I arose, that I might open to my Beloved. And I said, 'Lord, to the end that my heart may think, that my pen may write, and that my mouth may set forth Thy praise, pour both into my heart and pen and mouth Thy grace.' And the Lord said, 'Open thy mouth,' which He straightway filled with the spirit of wisdom and understanding; that by one I might speak truly, by the other perspicuously. And I say it in no wise arrogantly, but with all humility, and therefore boldly, that unless that Spirit of Wisdom and Understanding had been with me, and flowed in upon so difficult a metre, I could not have composed so long a work. For that kind of metre, continuous dactylic (except the final trochee or spondee), preserving also, as it does, the Leonine sonorousness, had almost, not to say altogether, grown obsolete through its difficulty; for Hildebert of Laverdin, who, from his immense learning, was first raised to the Episcopate and to the Metropolitan dignity, and Vuichard, Canon of Lyons, excellent versifiers, how little they wrote in this metre is manifest to all."¹

Dr. Coles has translated the cento of Trench, with some attempt to imitate, roughly, the rhythmic swing of the original; but the dactyls appear in his version as anapests—"a kind of verse better suited to the genius of English prosody—the dactylic form being seldom used, because less flowing and pleasing to the ear." A juster reason than that of Dr. Coles for the common employment of anapests instead of dactyls in English verse is, we think,

¹ Neale's Preface.

not the reason of pleasure, but of extreme difficulty. A language filled with necessary, but insignificant, particles will not lend itself readily either to trochaic or dactylic treatment. The version of the Doctor—who, by the way, is unwilling to admit Neale's contention that our language is wholly inapt for such metrical treatment as Bernard employs—is flowing and sonorous. There have been several versions into English, aiming more or less at some similarity with the original metre; but the best, or certainly the best-known and most popular, is the translation, or rather paraphrase, of Dr. Neale—"Hora Novissima," and he departs entirely from the metre of the monk of Cluny! In the face of such facts, we should perhaps offer some apology for the presumption that impels us to attempt another version, and at the same time embarrass our efforts by some slight approach to the metre of the original. We can only plead the intense attractiveness which the song of the Cluniac has exercised over us from the time—many years since—when the Latin lines,

Urbs Sion aurea, patria lactea, cive decora!
Omne cor obruis, omnibus obstruis, et cor et ora,

first filled our soul with their honeyed sweetness. The rhythmic melody has never lost its first charm, and will, even in the rougher strains of English, assert its undoubted prerogative of shaping the ruder verse.

Hic breve vivitur,
Hic breve plangitur,
Hic breve fletur:
Non breve vivere,
Non breve plangere,
Retribuetur.

O retributio!
Stat brevis actio,
Vita perennis;
O retributio!
Caelica mansio
Stat lue plenis;

Quid datur et quibus?
Aether egentibus
Et cruce dignis;
Sidera vermibus
Optima sontibus,
Astra malignis!

A day of dying here,
A day of sighing here,
A day of sorrow:
Ah! but supernal joys,
Yea, God's eternal joys
Wait for the morrow.

O blessed guerdon, Thou!
Brief is the burden now—
The joy ends never!
O blessed burden, Thou
Pledgest the guerdon now,
The rest forever!

To them that nothing own
But sin and stripes alone,
The skies are given!
The stars, to worms of earth;
To slaves, the noblest birth;
To sinners, Heaven!

Sunt modo prœlia,
Postmodo prœmia;
Qualia ? plena;
Plena refectio,
Nullaque passio,
Nullaque pœna.

Spe modo vivitur,
Et Syon angitur
A Babylone:
Nunc tribulatio;
Tunc recreatio,
Sceptra, coronae.

Tunc nova gloria
Pectora sobria
Clarificabit,
Solvēt enigmata,
Veraque sabbata
Continuabit.

Now must we battle do;
But the reward is true,
In blest completeness:
No sorrow enters there,
No pain nor any care
To dull its sweetness.

Babylon now is great;
Sion of high estate
Sitteth in sadness:
Now we have toil and pain—
Then shall our sceptered reign
Be peace and gladness.

Then shall a glory new
Souls of the Saints endue
With light supernal;
Life's riddles shall it read,
Life's sabbaths make indeed
Sabbaths eternal!

Like Simrock in his *Lauda Sion*, we have divided each hexameter into three parts; we have done this in order to present both Latin text and English version on the same page—at the risk, however, of making a verse appear trivial which, extending in the original through the sonorous rhythm of the hexameter, was designed to be stately and impressive.

Despite the intricate character of his rhyme and rhythm and quantity, the poet moves with evident ease. Trench notices that "it would be a mistake to regard this singular metre as the exclusive property of Bernard of Morlaix. We have, in Eddlestand du Meril's "*Poésies Populaires Latines*," p. 127, another thirteenth century poem in the same metre and on the same subject. I quote four lines:

O caro debilis, O cito labilis, O male mollis,
Quid petis ardua? quid tibi cornua ferrea tollis?
Quae modo florida, cras erit horrida, plus loquor, horror;
Horror amantibus, horror et hostibus, omnibus horror.

So, too, there is more than one poem by Hildebert in the same." Duffield recalls the hymn to Our Lady written by S. Peter Damian, which has the same form:

"O miseratrix, O dominatrix, praecipe dictu
Ne devastemur, ne lapidemur, grandinis ictu."

But these verses do not preserve *quantity*, and can hardly be com-

pared in difficulty of composition with the mètrical labors of Bernard. The work of Theodulus, referred to in this connection by the same author, is a much better illustration: "And, to go back farther still, a certain Theodulus, who lived in the reign of the Emperor Zeno (474-91) wrote a poem of nine hundred lines on Bernard's own theme, *De Contemptu Mundi*, in the same metre:

Pauper amabilis et venerabilis est benedictus
Dives inutilis insatiabilis, est maledictus.

Qui bona negligit et mala deligit intrat abyssum;
Nulla pecunia, nulla potentia liberat ipsum."

Liber et hostibus,
Et dominantibus
 Ibit Hebraeus;
Liber habebitur
Et celebrabitur
 Hinc jubilaeus.

There Israelites made free
Of all captivity
 Shall sound their pæans;
Franchised from woe and dree,
Shall keep a Jubilee
 Of endless aeons.

Patria luminis,
Inscia turbinis,
 Inscia litis,
Cive replebitur,
Amplificabitur
Israëlitis.

Land of the living light,
Land that hath never night,
 Nor strife, nor longing:
Lo! in each columned aisle
Israelites without guile
 There shall be thronging.

Patria splendida,
Terraque florida,
 Libera spinis,
Danda fidelibus
Est ibi civibus,
 Hic peregrinis.

Thornless of any woe,
Thy flowers shall gladly blow,
 Land of my dreaming:
To pilgrim hearts afar
Thou art the guiding star
 Through the night gleam-
 ing.

Tunc erit omnibus
Inspicientibus
 Ora Tonantis,
Summa potentia,
Plena scientia,
 Pax pia sanctis:

O on that happy day
When we shall see for aye
 The God of Power,
Wisdom beyond increase,
Knowledge and fullest peace
 Shall be our dower.

Pax sine crimine,
Pax sine turbine,
 Pax sine rixa,
Meta laboribus,
Atque tumultibus
 Anchora fixa.

O Peace, O Blessed Peace,
Granting to men surcease
 Of strife and rancor!
To weary feet, the goal;
To the storm-beaten soul,
 A goodly anchor!

Pars mea Rex meus,
In proprio Deus
Ipse decore :
Visus amabitur,
Atque videbitur
Auctor in ore.

My soul her King shall see ;
God shall her portion be,
Ne'er to forsake her :
See Him, to love alone ;
See Him, to know and own
Her awful Maker !

Tunc Jacob Israel
Et Lia tunc Rachel
Efficietur :
Tunc Syon atria
Pulcraque patria
Perficietur.

O, then shall Jacob be
Israel ; and Lia, the
Rachel of story :
Then shall thy bulwarks stand,
Sion, dear Fatherland,
Perfect in glory !

The mediæval mind was saturated with scriptural knowledge. Bernard's verse is only a slight part of the wide and elegant testimony which the literary monuments of the "Dark" ages give of a familiar acquaintance with the *forbidden Book*. One would have thought that Maitland's curious and interesting analysis of the D'Aubigné legend must have settled that question forever. But credulity is in the inverse ratio of knowledge ; and so it happens that the phantom of Protestant tradition, laid so often, still walks abroad periodically, not in the favoring shadows of a "Dark Age," but in the blinding glare of the electric light !

The reader will perhaps recall the fund of scriptural allusion in the exquisite dedication of the Cluniac's poem to the Abbot Peter. Chapter and verse are not indicated ; that was not an age of "hand-books," and "concordances," and "preacher's manuals," and the rest of the literary paraphernalia with which the modern student of the "Book" finds it so expedient to surround himself. But instead of direct and cumbrous quotations we find delicate hintings and intimations, which, forming the continuous texture of the poet's thought, suppose the readiest and fullest knowledge of the facts and the diction of both Testaments on the part of the reader, just as they manifest a similar knowledge on the part of the writer.

The symbolism which the poet makes use of in the line :

Tunc Jacob Israel, et Lia tunc Rachel efficietur

was well understood by mediæval minds. The strife shall not cease till the morning light of heaven dawns on that life of man which is, as Job puts it, a warfare. Jacob was addressed by the Angel : "Let me go, for it is break of day." He answered : "I will not let thee go except thou bless me." Jacob prevails, and in sign of his reward, receives the new name of *Israel*. Possibly the poet had also in mind the beautiful but incorrect interpretation of St.

Augustine, Hilarius, Eusebius, and others, who made Israel *is ro cl, vir videns Deum*. The "true Israelite" shall be another Jacob, become in heaven, "Israel," "*seeing God*" in the beatific vision. The contrast between the sorrows and tears of our earthly exile and the abiding peace and sweet contemplation of the Fatherland is further insisted upon in the reference to Lia and Rachel: "Nam sicut Rachelis est intelligere, meditari, contemplari: sic profecto pertinet ad Liam flere, gemere, suspirare," as Richard of St. Victor interprets symbolically in *De Duodec. Patriarch*. The monk of Cluny would see in Rachel the eternal realization of the tropological interpretation of the names of Lia and Rachel, current in the Middle Ages. They signified respectively the active and the contemplative life. St. Bernard, in his work, "*De Bene Viv.* . . .," draws the comparison between the two very fully, saying, amongst other things, of the contemplative soul: "*Ita ut jam nihil agere libeat, sed despectis omnibus curis saeculi, ad videndum faciem sui Creatoris animus inardescat: ita ut jam noverit carnis corruptibilis pondus cum mœrore portare, totisque desideriis optare hymnidicis angelorum choris interesse, appetere admisceri coelestibus civibus, de aeterna incorruptione in conspectu Dei gaudere.*" The monk of Clairvaux sees in Rachel the soul that is longing "*in conspectu Dei gaudere*"; the monk of Cluny would read in her name the symbolism, not so much of promise, as of happy fulfillment:

Tunc Syon atria
Pulcraque patria
Perficietur,

O bona patria,
Lumina sobria
 Te speculantur;
Ad tua nomina
Sobria lumina
 Collacrimantur:

Est tua mentio
Pectoris unctio,
 Cura doloris,
Concupientibus
Aethera mentibus
 Ignis amoris.

Tu locus unicus,
Illeque caelicus
 Es paradisus;
Non ibi lacrima,
Sed placidissima
 Gaudia, risus.

Yet doth the brimming eye
See in thy peaceful sky
 A tempered gladness:
Yet is thy sweet name fain
Flood gates to ope amain
 Of soothing sadness!

Nathless 'tis healing balm!
To the tossed soul, a calm
 'Midst evils thronging:
To hearts that soar above,
A flaming tongue of love—
 Of love and longing!

Fairer than Eden lies
The heavenly Paradise
 Of the hereafter:
Tears may not dim the eye—
Lo! the o'erarching sky
 Echoes with laughter!

Est ibi consita
Laurus, et insita
 Cedrus hysopo;
Sunt radiantia
Jaspide moenia,
 Clara pyropo;
Hinc tibi sardius,
Inde topazius,
 Hinc amethystus;
Est tua fabrica
Concio cælica,
 Gemmaque Christus.

Tu sine littore,
Tu sine tempore,
 Fons, modo rivus,
Dulce bonis sapis,
Estque tibi lapis
 Undique vivus.

Est tibi laurea,
Dos datur aurea,
 Sponsa decora,
Primaque Principis
Oscula suscipis,
 Inspicis ora:

Candida lilia,
Viva monilia
 Sunt tibi, Sponsa,
Agnus adest tibi,
Sponsus adest tibi,
 Lux speciosa:

Tota negotia,
Cantica dulcia
 Dulce tonare,
Tam mala debita,
Quam bona præbita
 Conjubilare.

Urbs Syon aurea,
Patria lactea
 Cive decora,
Omne cor obruis,
Omnibus obstruis,
 Et cor et ora.

Laurels are in thy land;
Solemn thy cedars stand
 With fragrance flowing:
No eye hath e'er beheld
Jasper or emerald
 Like to thine glowing;

Nor ruddy sardius,
Nor topaz splendidous,
 Amethyst gory:
Builded of Saints alone,
Christ is thy corner-stone,
 Thy gem and glory!

Silent and shoreless sea!
Day of eternity!
 Upspringing fountain!
Builded of living stone,
Goodness is thine alone,
 Sion's glad mountain!

In thee the Saviour finds
Beauty! with laurel binds
 Thy sunlit tresses,
Spouse of His loving grace,
Who gazest on His face,
 Fed with caresses!

Lilies of dazzling white,
Gems of serenest light
 Gleam for thy pleasure:
Ah! but the LAMB is thine:
HE is thy Spouse Divine,
 Thy dearest treasure!

Sing, then, an endless song;
Let the full strophes long
 Tell the high story—
How in thy low estate,
Thy God hath given thee great,
 Exceeding glory!

Golden thy bulwarks shine;
Honey and milk are thine,
 Sion the Blessed!
Longing for thy sweet joys,
The fainting heart and voice
 Sink all oppressed!

Nescio, nescio,
 Quae jubilatio,
 Lux tibi qualis,
 Quam socialia
 Gaudia, gloria
 Quam specialis :

Ah me ! I cannot know
 What is thy mystic glow,
 Thy jubilation,
 Thy storms of heavenly noise,
 Thy tender social joys,
 Thy gloriation.

Laude stndens ea
 Tollere, mens mea
 Victa fatiscit :
 O bona gloria,
 Vincor ; in omnia
 Laus tua vicit.

The brush that painteth you,
 Sion's celestial hue,
 Drearly painteth :
 My song should be unsung :
 For oh ! my trembling tongue
 Wearily fainteth.

Sunt Syon atria
 Conjubilantia,
 Martyre plena,
 Cive micantia,
 Principe stantia,
 Luce serena :

Jubilant are thy halls ;
 And all thy golden walls
 Shout the glad story :
 Thine is the martyrs' throng ;
 The Prince his court among
 The gleam and glory.

Est ibi pascua,
 Mitibus afflua,
 Præstita sanctis ;
 Regis ibi thronus,
 Agminis et sonus
 Est epulantis.

There is the light serene ;
 There are the pastures green ;
 There is no sadness :
 There is the kingly throne ;
 There can be heard alone
 Feasting and gladness !

The stanzas beginning with that overflow of melodic sweetness, "Urbs Syon aurea," etc., will be forever linked, no doubt, with their most genuine version in English, the "Jerusalem the Golden" of Rev. Dr. Neale. "This scholar of Cambridge, and this monk of Cluny, have given to the religious world the sweetest and dearest poem that our language contains,"—thus, Judge Noyes, in "Seven Great Hymns." He even goes so far as to assert that *The Celestial Country* is better than *De Contemptu Mundi*,—very enthusiastic praise of a version which Dr. Coles finds occasional fault with. Still, the present writer wishes to record his admiration and praise—no less sincere, if not quite so enthusiastic—of that version. For, indeed, although differing wholly in metre, both poets have shown their mastery of "the art of arts," and, under an exquisitely simple garb of expression, concealed their art. The merit of Dr. Neale's translation was early recognized. In the third edition of "Mediæval Hymns," published in 1867, he expresses his "grati-

tude to God for the favor He has given some of the centos made from the poem, but especially *Jerusalem the Golden*. It has found a place in some twenty hymnals; and, for the last two years, it has hardly been possible to read any newspaper which gives prominence to ecclesiastical news, without seeing its employment chronicled at some dedication or other festival. It is also a great favorite with Dissenters, and has obtained admission in Roman Catholic services." (Page 70.)

Gens duce splendida,
Concio candida
 Vestibus albis
Sunt sine fletibus
In Syon aedibus,
 Ædibus almis;

Sunt sine crimine,
Sunt sine turbine,
 Sunt sine lite
In Syon aedibus
Editioribus
 Israëlitæ.

Urbs Syon inclyta,
Gloria debita
 Glorificandis,
Tu bona visibus
Interioribus
 Intima pandis.

Intima lumina,
Mentis acumina
 Te speculantur;
Pectora flammea
Spe modo, postea
 Sorte lucrantur.

Urbs Syon unica,
Mansio mystica,
 Condita coelo,
Nunc tibi gaudeo,
Nunc mihi lugeo,
Tristor, anhelo:
VOL. XVIII.—52

There, clad in raiment white,
The Prince's radiance bright
 His people borrow:
O never, nevermore,
Shall sighs of sadness pour
 Or tears of sorrow.

No care nor any sin
Can ever enter in,
 No strife of passion:
In Sion's livery dight
Stands the true Israelite
 Whom Christ doth fashion.

Noble Jerusalem!
Glory and crown of them
 Who thee inherit!
Thy hidden beauty lies
Plain to the inner eyes
 Of the rapt spirit.

As thy recess unfolds,
The eye of Faith beholds
 Thine utter treasure:
Me then shall hope sustain
Till the clear sight may gain
 All without measure.

Thy mystic halls, Sion,
Thine only walls lie on
 Heaven's foundations.
How my heart panteth for,
Longeth and fainteth for
 Thy consolations!

Te qui corpore
 Non queo, pectore
 Saepe penetro,
 Sed caro terrea,
 Terraque carnea,
 Mox cado retro.

Nemo retexere
 Nemoque promere
 Sustinet ore,
 Quo tua moenia,
 Quo capitalia
 Plena decore:

Opprimit omne cor
 Ille tuus decor,
 O Syon, O pax;
 Urbs sine tempore,
 Nulla potest fore
 Laus tibi mendax.

If flesh soar not so high,
 Let then the inner eye
 Oft see the vision!
 Alas! poor flesh and earth
 Falleth soon, nothing worth
 Such bliss Elysian!

No tongue may long retain
 The sweetness of the strain
 Thy beauty praising—
 How thy walls lofty climb,
 Their pillared heads sublime
 In triumph raising!

O dear Jerusalem,
 Thy peace oppresseth them
 Fain to salute thee:
 No tongue can offer thee
 Praises enough for thee,
 City of Beauty!

How the "heavenly home-sickness," as Trench beautifully calls it, breathes through these lines with most pathetic accent! "Nunc tibi lugeo, tristor, anhelio," is an echo of the Royal Psalmist's "my soul longeth and fainteth for the courts of the Lord." Trench recalls the exquisite ode of Casimir, "the great Latin poet of Poland," the Jesuit whose limpid verse attains even to the Horatian fount of poetic thought and expression. "Urit me patriae decor" has been Englished very successfully by Isaac Watts, and still better by Dr. Neale:

"It kindles all my soul,
 My Country's loveliness" . . .

George Herbert's *Come, Lord, my heart is sick*; Coffin's *Moraris heu! nimis diu*; Faber's *O Paradise, O Paradise, who doth not crave thy rest?* Bonar's *The home-sickness*, are all repetitions of the Cluniac's groaning and sighing, and of that elder cry of the Beloved Disciple and Apostle of Love: "Come, Lord JESUS!" (Apoc., xxii., 20).

O sine luxibus,
 O sine luctibus,
 O sine lite,
 Splendida curia,
 Florida patria,
 Patria vitae!

No din is at thy gate,
 No lust nor any hate,
 Nor sordid striving;
 Splendid thy temples stand,
 Flowery Fatherland,
 Land of the living!

Urbs Syon inclyta,
Turris et edita
 Littore tuto,
Te peto, te colo,
Te flagro, te volo,
 Canto, saluto.

Nec meritis peto,
Nam meritis meto
 Morte perire;
Nec reticens tego
Quod meritis ego
 Filius irae:

Vita quidem mea,
Vita nimis rea,
 Mortua vita,
Quippe reatibus
Exitialibus
 Obruta, trita.

Spe tamen ambulo,
Praemia postulo
 Speque fideque;
Illa perennia
Postulo præmia
 Nocte dieque.

Me Pater optimus
Atque piissimus
 Ille creavit;
In lue pertulit,
Ex lue sustulit,
 A lue lavit.

Gratia cælica
Sustinet unica
 Totius orbis
Parcere sordibus,
Interioribus
 Unctio morbis:

Diluit omnia
Cælica gratia,
 Fons David undans
Omnia diluit,
Omnibus affluit,
 Omnia mundans:

Sion, on thy fair shore
Are hushed forevermore
 Sea-beats of sadness:
Thee I seek, Thee I sing,
Thee I wish, Thee I bring
 Greetings of gladness!

Not as though meriting—
Oh! disinheriting
 Is my just measure:
For I cannot conceal
That I should only feel
 Heaven's displeasure!

Life, thou hast been to me
Guiltiness, sin to me;
 Dying, not living!
Waste with the weariness,
Dark with the dreariness
 Of thine own giving.

Yet do I walk in trust,
Joyances of the Just
 Humbly imploring;
Prayers for Eternal Rest,
From this o'ercharged breast
 Day and night pouring!

For the Almighty God
Fashioned my earthly clod,
 Made me and blest me:
In my shame patiently
Bore with me, lifted me,
 Washed me, caressed me!

And his unwearied grace
Seeketh in every place
 To grant anelings,
To wash our stains away,
And all our pains allay
 With balsam healing.

The fount of David flows
To lessen all our woes,
 And all affliction;
To soothe our every smart,
To fill the empty heart
 With benediction.

O pia gratia,
 Celsa palatia
 Cernere praesta,
 Ut videam bona,
 Festaque consona,
 Cælica festa.

O mea, spes mea,
 Tu Syon aurea,
 Clarior auro,
 Agmine splendida,
 Stans duce, florida
 Perpete lauro ;

O bona patria,
 Num tua gaudia
 Teque videbo ?
 O bona patria,
 Num tua præmia
 Plena tenebo ?

Dic mihi, flagito,
 Verbaque reddito,
 Dicque, Videbis !
 Spem solidam gero ;
 Remne tenens ero ?
 Dic, Retinebis !

O sacer, O pius,
 O ter et amplius
 Ille beatus,
 Cui sua pars Deus :
 O miser, O reus,
 Hac viduatus !

Grant then, sweet Grace, that I
 Dwell soon in mansions high,
 Far from all sadness ;
 O then this rapt heart shall
 Prolong the carnival
 In festive gladness.

Sion, thou Hope of mine !
 Than gold more bright doth
 shine
 Thy light supernal ;
 Thy hosts in beauty rare
 The twining laurel wear
 Springing eternal.

Fatherland ! shall I see
 What joys are waiting me,
 Safe in thy portal ?
 Shall I securely hold
 Thy royal crown of gold
 In life immortal ?

Here at thy tender feet,
 Say to me, Jesu sweet,
 " Yea, thou shalt see it ;"
 Be this my hope and stay !
 Shall it e'er fade away ?
 Bid me not dree it !

O rich in happiness
 Whom Jesus thus shall bless !
 Thrice and thrice blessed !
 But oh ! what hope of bliss
 For the poor wretch of this
 ONE dispossessed !

These verses of Bernard form the cento made by Trench. They do not represent a continuous part of the original, but have been selected here and there with a view to beauty and consecutiveness of thought. For not all of the original maintains the same high standard of diction and graceful imagery. One of the defects in the poem, noted by Trench, is "its want of progress. The poet, instead of advancing, eddies round and round his subject, recurring again and again to that which he seemed to have thoroughly treated and dismissed." He therefore "mitigated" the defect "by

some prudent omissions." Neale's love for the theme and the treatment alike urged him to give a second translation of much greater extent than his first (which was a version of the larger part of Trench's cento), not always with equal fidelity of choice and elegance of rendering. While acknowledging that Trench's selection was "very beautiful," he nevertheless thought it "a mere patchwork—much being transposed as well as cancelled; so that the editor's own admission that he has adopted 'some prudent omissions,' would scarcely give a fair idea of the liberties which have been taken with it." As the fuller cento of Rev. Dr. Neale has been widely diffused amongst the lovers of hymns both in the *Mediæval Hymns* and in *Seven Great Hymns*, it may be interesting to record here the opinion of Dr. Coles, a Newark physician of cultured taste and elegant literary bent, who comments as follows on the larger work: "Whether by this process there was not as much lost as gained admits of some doubt. It set aside Trench's labor of love as impertinent or useless. The matter of the earlier translation, with which many had become familiar, could only be found by diligent search, *disjecta membra poetæ*, scattered everywhere up and down the later work. One, however, might become reconciled to this, provided improvement always followed; but we think this can hardly be claimed. On the contrary, what is added too often appears crude, or incongruous, or out of place, or of inferior interest. For example, we read:

Here is the warlike trumpet,
There, life set free from sin,
When to the last Great Supper
The faithful shall come in;
When the heavenly net is laden
With fishes many and great,
(So glorious is its fulness
And so involate).

Without access to the original, it would be impossible to say which is responsible, the author or the translator, for the strange groupings contained in the following verses:

Jesus the Gem of Beauty,
True God and Man, they sing,
The *never-failing* Garden,
The *ever-golden* Ring,
The Door, the Pledge, the Husband,
The Guardian of the Court,
The Day-Star of Salvation,
The Porter and the Port.'

What better is this than a distracting medley of names, whose meaning and fitness, so far from being immediately obvious, it is

hard to discover even with time and study. Certainly, one needs to possess a rare nimbleness of fancy to qualify him to overleap such wide spaces as intervene between 'the never-failing Garden' and the 'ever-golden Ring,' thence on from 'the Door, the Pledge, the Husband,' to the distant and final resting-place, 'the Porter and the Port' (whatever these may be), without longer pauses in the transition than the punctuation calls for. The framer of the Cento did well, therefore, we think, in leaving out lines like these, and no advantage has resulted from their restoration" ("Old Gems in New Settings," second edition).

All of those whose opinion concerning the merit of the original has fallen under our eye, seem to unite in a single chorus of praise—not of the whole poem, but of that introductory part which we are now considering, variously entitled by its Englished versions, "The Better Country," "Hora Novissima," "Laus Patriae Coelestis," "The Celestial Country," etc. Thus, for example, Neale: "I have no hesitation in saying that I look on these verses of Bernard as the most lovely, in the same way that the *Dies Iræ* is the most sublime, and the *Stabat Mater* the most pathetic, of mediæval poems. They are even superior to that glorious hymn on the same subject, the *De Gloria et gaudiis Paradisi* of St. Peter Damiani."

So, too, Coles thinks that "it possesses the elements of genuine power—has indeed that imperishable principle of lyric life which fits it to be the interpreter of the human heart in all ages, in the nineteenth century no less than the twelfth." Duffield says: "In the twelfth century—the time of the great crusade—we find the noblest and purest of Latin hymns. It is the age of Hildebert, Abelard, Bernard of Clairvaux, Peter of Cluny, and Adam of St. Victor. But among them all I find no one who has inspired a deeper and more lovely desire for the heavenly land than Bernard of Cluny." Trench thinks that "no one with a sense for the true passion of poetry, even when it manifests itself in forms the least to his liking, will deny the breath of a real inspiration to the author of these dactylic hexameters." Schaff says: "This glowing description of the celestial country is the sweetest of all the New Jerusalem hymns of heavenly home-sickness, which have taken their inspiration from the last two chapters of Revelation." Julian calls it a "magnificent poem"; and Wrangham says that "*De Contemptu Mundi* remains as an imperishable monument of an author of whom we know little besides his name, and that a name over-shadowed in his own day and in ours by his more illustrious contemporary and namesake, the saintly Abbot of Clairvaux."

Without desiring to sound a discordant note in the midst of such a harmonious chorus, and without attempting to lessen the

real excellence of Bernard's muse, we may be permitted to question whether that excellence is the sole inspiration of all this chorussing. The fact is that Bernard's poem has been made to contribute some of its verses to that work of Flacius Illyricus which his zealous hatred of the "Church of Rome" urged him to compile, the "Catalogus Testium Veritatis." The text of this work of the Lutheran zealot contains eighty-five lines of the poem, while the whole was published in the "Varia doctorum piorumque Virorum de Corrupto Ecclesiae Statu Poemata," a supplement to the "Catalogus." "Flacius was an unwearied searcher of the libraries of Europe for material to use on the Lutheran side of the great controversy" . . . "it was the part Trench passed by for which Matthias Flacius Illyricus, its first editor, cared the most" (Duffield). Flacius seems to have been so very zealous in editing his "Catalogue of Witnesses for the Truth," as to have ranged himself somewhat questionably on her side. Peter the Venerable is found in his work as an accuser against "Rome!" Maitland, in "The Dark Ages," prints the whole of the letter of Peter the Venerable to the Pope, from which Flacius extracts a few lines, while leaving unnoticed the professions of love, obedience, respect for the Supreme Pontiff, with which the letter abounds. The passage he extracts is, in the context, an encomium of the Carthusians, but on it Flacius builds a curiously inferential argument. It is simply amazing how a man who was even "one of the most fiercely zealous, not to say ferocious, of the Protestant party in the sixteenth century," as the Anglican Maitland describes him, could have found any comfort in any part of this long Epistle of Peter's. It commences: "To the supreme Pontiff, and our special Father, the Lord Pope Eugenius, Brother Peter, the lowly Abbot of the brethren of Clugni, sends devout obedience with sincere affection"; goes on to speak of his high office "over the nations and over kingdoms," etc., employing, towards the close, the expression *majestati vestrae*. "Was the person who was thus writing to the Pope . . . a witness against the Romish Antichrist?" asks Maitland, in evident disgust.

In this long digression we have not forgotten Bernard, the disciple of this venerable abbot of Cluny. His poem, of which "the greater part is a bitter satire on the fearful corruptions of the age" (says Neale), must not be looked at with an eye that is ready to see but the dark side of a picture. An age which could produce a St. Norbert, a St. Bernard, a Peter the Venerable, the many holy and sweet singers of godly things who were contemporaries of our Bernard who sang so ecstatically of heaven; a half-century which saw the foundations laid of the Order of Premonstratensians and the wonderful Order, too, of the Cistercians; which produced a

Peter Lombard, a Hugh of St. Victor, a Eugenius III.—these years, just preceding the probable composition of the *De Contemptu Mundi*, could not have been wholly evil.

The fact is, that a fair estimate of an age can never be gleaned from, we shall not say a *poetic satire*, but even from a prose philippic. The eye of a Flacius, which by some peculiar religious strabismus could find grains of Protestant metal in the golden fashioning of him whose own age styled him "Venerable," this kind of an eye could read wholesale condemnation, doubtless, in the work of Bernard of Cluny. Nevertheless, it was an evil time, not alone to the poet's soul—made sensitive to every shade of evil by the bright purity and peace of his life and calling—but even to the duller senses of this age of impiety. For the Church was a prey to the evils consequent on irreligious state-craft, the haughty claims of Cæsarism, and the ambition of worldly-minded prelates. When, indeed, shall the millennium of freedom from such evils come to the Spouse of Christ? In all times

"Syon angitur a Babylone."

And in all times will she protest against such evils with the most zealous of the "reformers," as she has protested against them in the past, as she protested against and *legislated* against them even in the life-time of our Bernard, in the Ninth Œcumenical Council (1123). Shall we condemn an institution which thus sets its face sternly, however impotently, against all corruption? Evil times there were and evil men; but the Holy Spouse of Christ, fretted to the soul in their midst, is not amenable to the judgments passed against those whom she herself condemned.

At best, the argument of *evils* is a poor one, unless exhaustive and fairly stated. With horror did the piety of the Middle Ages record what our age is too willing to accept without such shuddering comment. But who thought of chronicling the endless and widespread, but quiet and unobtrusive, piety of those ages of Faith?

"The evil that men do lives after them;
The good is oft interred with their bones,"

If some Flacius were to make a digest of all the wickedness chronicled—not in several centuries of our reformed age, but in the newspaper literature of a single day, and should hand such a volume down to posterity as a picture of the times we live in, we certainly should not figure as an age when justice, purity, honesty, piety, were very highly prized. But who—except the Recording Angel—is even now setting down the details of many a "life hidden with Christ in God?"

We have been betrayed into a longer excursion than we had intended to allow ourselves in this matter. But our Cluniac has been made to perform a service which we must believe to have been wholly foreign to his purpose in the composition of his "bitter satire." Because he inveighed against times which produced an anti-pope, and an Arnold of Brescia, and in the midst of such disturbing influences, produced also simoniacal abuses, we know that his eye could not be closed to the piety of his brethren, and to the efforts made by the Church to correct the evil influences and customs of the age.

Our fragmentary account of Bernard and his song would be incomplete without some notice of the hexameters composed by him as a sort of introduction or prelude to his greater work. In them he employs still the strict quantitative prosody of the classical metre, but employs a different scheme of assonance and rhyme from that which we have been considering, *e.g.* :

"Chartula nostra *tibi* || mandat dilecte *salutes*,
 Plura vides *ibi* *si* || modo non mea dona *refutes*.
 Dulcia sunt *animæ* || solatia quæ tibi *mando* ;
 Sed prosunt *minime* || si non serves *operando*.
 Quæ mea verba *monent* || tu noli tradere *vento*
 Cordis in aure *sonent* || et sic retinere *memento*,
 Ut tibi grande *bonum* || nostri monitus *operentur*,
 Perque dei *donum* || tibi caelica regna *parentur*."

The corresponding parts of each couplet rhyme—the linear caesura indicating the place of the first rhyming syllables. We reproduce the scheme of rhyming in English :

"Greeting to thee it giveth, Friend, this script that I offer :
 Much of good in it liveth, for whoso takes what I proffer,
 Counsels sweet to the spirit, the soul to happiness wooing :
 Yet shall they nothing merit till hearing be followed by doing.
 Take these comforts endearing nor cast to the scattering breezes ;
 But in the heart give hearing while memory faithfully seizes.
 Then by my words the graces and gifts of God shall be given,
 Winning in earthly places the crown of the Kingdom of Heaven."

The rhyme then varies in another way—the hemistichs of each verse becoming the rhyming pairs :

"Menti *sincerae* possunt hæc verba *placere*
 Hæciter ostendunt, hostantur, non reprehendunt.
 Words they are that shall dearly please who heareth sincerely :
 Show they the beauty abiding—gently winning, not chiding !"

And he seeks to show the "beauty abiding" in contrast with the evils and woes that encompass the wicked ; for while

"His qui salvantur semper bona multa parantur,
Sic mala multa malis properat mors exitialis."

The good shall rejoice, the evil shall weep, forever :

"Isti gaudebunt, isti sine fine dolebunt,
Nemo potest fari nec scribere nec meditari
Gaudia justorum, nec non tormenta malorum.
Heu male fraudatur, vah ! stulte ludificatur,
Qui propter florem mundi, vanumque decorem,
Qui prius apparet flos, et protinus aret,
Vadit ad infernum perdens diadema supernum,
Quod dominus donat cunctis quos ipse coronat."

"These shall dwell in gladness, but those forever in sadness;
Never can tongue express it, nor pen,—yea, mind cannot guess it,
Heaven's bright glory, Hell's unending, pitiful story.
Blind in the world's dark fashion, vah ! foolish plaything of pas-
sion,
Who for an earthly flower—the empty joy of an hour,
Which to-day is woven, to-morrow cast into the oven—
Gaineth but pains eternal, loseth beauty supernal
Unto the faithful given by Him who crowneth in Heaven."

The poet is more felicitous in the more difficult verse. Far from being embarrassed by it, he seems to catch from its accumulated intricacies greater zest and larger freedom and tenderer inspiration. But, doubtless, it is the theme that inspires him, as it has inspired so many longing hearts. For, with Lowell, "Who hath not been a poet" at some fugitive moment of world-quiet? and who has not felt with Coleridge, that

"In some hour of solemn jubilee
The massy gates of Paradise are thrown
Wide open, and come forth in fragments wild,
Sweet echoes of unearthly melodies—
And odors snatched from beds of amaranth,
And dews that from the crystal river of Life
Spring up on freshened wing, ambrosial gales !
The favored good man in his lonely walk
Perceives them, and his silent spirit drinks
Strange bliss, which he shall recognize in Heaven."

HUGH T. HENRY.

REUNION OR SUBMISSION.

WHAT is meant by "a reunion of the Churches?" The phrase is, perhaps, purposely indefinite. There cannot be reunion where there never was union; and it is certain that between Catholicity and Heresy there never was union of faith or obedience. Let us examine into the fiction "reunion," and see whether we can discover a better word.

The High Church party in England, when they advocate reunion, mean the union of "the Roman, Greek and Anglican Branches" of what they account the whole Catholic Church. To a Catholic it is obvious that such a union would be, theoretically and practically, impossible. First, there is the assumption that the three Branches, so called, were at one time united as one whole. But there never was, never could be, such a union. Czarodoxy and Anglicanism—two "Branches" out of the three—are bitterly opposed in principle to Catholicity, and cannot, therefore, be derived from her maternity. Czarodoxy is a revolt against the authority of the Holy See, while Anglicanism, in addition to being such a revolt, is an apostacy from a great part of the Catholic faith; nor does Czarodoxy recognize the orthodoxy of the Church of England, or regard its Orders as derived from the Apostles. It is obvious, therefore, that there cannot be a reunion of "Branches" which never were united, just as it is obvious that the Catholic Church, which was never Czarodox or Anglican, cannot be reunited to "Branches" it never recognized. The phrase, therefore, "reunion of the Churches," has no meaning, accurately speaking, in High Church sense; while, in Low Church sense, the phrase means the union of all Dissenters with an Establishment which has never owned them as her children. Some better word, some more accurate word, than reunion must be found to meet the difficulties of the case. And that better word, that more accurate word is Submission—submission of all Protestants to the Catholic Church.

"No," will exclaim both Anglicans and Dissenters, "Submission is too humiliating an idea." Humiliating it is, if taken in a wrong sense, but cheering and elevating in a right sense. There cannot be humiliation in the submitting to an authority which we recognize as rightful and legitimate. It is in submitting to an authority which we do *not* recognize that there is a sense of affront to our self-respect. For example, is there anything humiliating in obedience to our parents, or in obedience to the laws of our country,

or even in obedience to such rulers of any society as are formulated for the order of its members? None whatever. And why not in any one of the three cases? Simply because parental authority is recognized as legitimate, equally in a human and divine sense; because the laws of a country are as essential to our protection as they are essential to the very existence of a state; and because the social rules of any society are as much a safeguard to its members as they are a fortress beyond which outsiders cannot penetrate. There is no humiliation in such submission. On the contrary, humiliation would follow quickly on disobedience to parents, on the infraction of any one of a nation's laws, or even on the ostracism to which the breaking of a society's rules would expose every non-conforming member. It is not then submission, in each one of these three instances, which involves the dreaded punishment of humiliation; it is the refusal to submit obediently to properly constituted authority which alone merits the penalty and the shame.

The non-Catholic will here object to us very reasonably: "Yes, perfectly true as to an authority which is recognized; but how do you show that submission to the Catholic Church stands on the same level with the examples you have given? I must affirm that it does not, because, whereas in your three examples we recognize the authority, we do *not* recognize authority in the Roman Church. Hence you are simply begging the question."

Now our reply to this objection will be as follows: The *assertion* of authority is a primary cause of obedience, because assertion implies a conscious right. In almost all human matters the assertion of authority is three-fourths of the vindication of its claim. If a parent said to a son, "do *not* obey me," or if the state said to a subject, "do *not* obey me," there would be very little obedience in either case. But because the parent says, emphatically, "you must obey me," and because the state says, emphatically, "you must obey me," there is positively no questioning of an authority of which the assertion implies the right to be obeyed. And the analogy is so close—we do not say it is complete—between the Catholic Church, the parent, and the state that we shall be able to show in a few minutes that the assertion of divine authority is in itself a vindication of its right.

We begin by observing that the Catholic Church is the *only* Church which makes the assertion of its own divine authority,—that is of the divine right to be obeyed. It can be proved, beyond the possibility of questioning, that no other church, sect, denomination—from the Czar's Church down to the minutest Christian body—ever did claim, or does now claim, to have sole divine authority to command obedience from all Christians in the world.

The Czar's Church is so far from making this assertion that it confesses itself to be a purely political machine for the working out of the unity of the empire, nor has it ever tried, outside that empire, to convert the heathen to Christianity, nor has it ever exhibited the smallest interest in their conversion. Christian missions have had no patronage from the Russian Czar. Persecution is the sole mission-work of the whole empire. And this one fact by itself would prove that the Russian Church makes no assertion of the divine authority to teach the world. But, more than this, the Czar's Church does not pretend to define dogma; it has never dreamed of summoning councils to rule the faith; it is an absolutely dead body in the sense of that development which is the sure sign of life in the teaching Church. The Russian "Holy Synod" is a mere sham, with no pretension to dogmatize on Christian doctrine in response to the attacks of unbelievers. Indeed, schism has so utterly dried up the Russian "Branch"—has so withered its spiritual vitality throughout the empire—that it would be true to say that in shivered Protestantism there is more of the old Catholic spirit than in that Communion of which Photius was the beginner.

And as to the Church of England, she affirms emphatically that she cannot teach; that, as "all churches have erred," so can she err; and she is so wrath with the Catholic Church for proclaiming her infallibility—for defining its exact limits, and where it resides—that she cannot forgive her such a formal censure of Anglican humanness, of Anglican vacillation and fallibility.

As to Dissenters, it suffices to make the remark that the very existence of their varieties is the proclamation of the rights of heresy, of the Christian privilege, the Christian duty, of infinite schism.

There is then only one Christian body in the world which *asserts* her divine authority to teach all nations; and though the assertion, in itself, would not prove possession, yet it creates a strong presumption in its favor. Just as, to return to our analogy, no one would think of obeying a parent who should say, "I have no authority from God or man to presume to teach you"; nor would any one think of obeying the laws of a state which should say, "Pray, make your own laws for yourselves, for I have no authority to command any compliance, or to punish any political heretic or schismatic;" so no one who believed in the divinity of the Christian religion should think of obeying the Czar's religion or Queen Victoria's religion (or the religion of any one of the 242 English sects, or the religion of any one of the 220 American sects), since every one of these religious bodies acknowledges that it has no

more authority than self-will and self-pleasing can confer upon it. And since the authority of a divine Teacher is not only to make laws, but to rule the whole faith which concerns salvation, that authority must demand an obedience more intellectual and more moral, more binding upon the spiritual nature of every Christian, than all the authorities of parents and states put together, which only busy themselves with the philosophy of temporal life.

If we should allow, then, the thorough reasonableness of the objection, "The mere assertion of divine authority, apart from other credentials, does not amount to proof positive of its possession," we should nevertheless be able to demonstrate that the *disclaimer* of divine authority is proof positive that it cannot be possessed. "I cannot teach you, because I am as fallible as you are," is the same thing with saying, "I have no divine authority, any more than have the lay members of my Communion." And this is what all the "churches," save only the Catholic Church, say to their co-authoritative disciples. All the "churches," therefore, save only the Catholic Church, confess that they are purely human institutions; their "theology" is constructed out of the private opinions of individuals, who take themselves for their sole guides in determining truth. They even glory in what they call their "liberty of private judgment," the liberty of being the slaves of their own eclecticism. Their "authority" is their private estimate of one or more Protestant teachers, or of the comparative worth of their own views upon all doctrines. In other words, they have no authority at all. To call a man's own estimate of an individual teacher, or a man's own estimate of his interpretation of the Scriptures "a divine authority which is all-sufficient and reliable," is to make a jest of the most important question to the human soul. Yet this is the one only "divine" authority which any person can possess outside the Church. It matters not whether a man be Orthodox or Anglican, whether he be a Baptist or a Quaker; his only "divine" authority is his private judgment of his teachers, or his private judgment of the whole teaching of the New Testament.

Nor is it worth while to linger on this last point—"the private judgment of the whole teaching of the New Testament." No fallacy has done more harm to Christian souls than that fallacy which has been the staple of all Protestantism: "the private interpretation of the Bible is the same thing with the Bible itself." Common sense might have sufficed to explode a theory which is the deification of ignorance and presumption. To talk of the Bible as being "the sole divine authority," apart from the divine interpretation of the Bible, is like asserting of astronomy that it

can be perfectly apprehended by gazing upon the heavens on a star-lit night. The fallacy of so-called Bible Christianity has been demonstrated by every sect that has been started, and by every disciple of every sect new or old. That fallacy should be too worn out to need discussion. Divine authority *does* reside in the Bible, but not in the private interpretation of the Bible.

II.

That "The disclaimer of Divine Authority by all the sects is proof positive that not one of them can possess it," we may take to be a sort of Christian postulate. Where one Church, and only one, says "I *can* teach because I possess divine authority"; and where all the other churches, sects, denominations, say "I *cannot* teach because I have no divine authority," we see the hopelessness of "re-uniting" what was never united, what always was, always must be, antagonistic. Yet not more inaccurate is the popular word "reunion" than is the popular word "churches" in Protestant sense. There cannot be "churches." In the sense used in the New Testament, and in the sense used by Catholic nations, we may speak of "The Church in Italy," "The Church in France"; but the word so used, so far from meaning different Churches, means national parts of one and the same Catholic Church. The sense in which non-Catholics use the word—as when they say the Greek Church, or the Anglican Church—is the sense of perfectly distinct, inimical bodies; having some doctrines in common, but no authority in common, indeed protesting against each other's assumed authority. In this sense there cannot be churches. If there could be, there could be also Christianities; and therefore, it would follow, there could be Christs. One God, one faith, one baptism, imply necessarily one Catholic Church—one in Divine authority, and therefore one in Divine faith; one in allegiance, devotion and sentiment. So that when men talk of reunion of the churches, they use a phrase which is painfully inaccurate. There never was but one Church; all schismatics, all heretics being outside that one Church—unless they are baptized and in good faith. In this latter case, though they would be outside the Visible Church, yet they would be, spiritually, its members; for all baptized Christians are baptized into the Roman Church, and remain inside till they put themselves outside. The High Church idea about being "baptized into the Anglican faith" is transparently absurd and even impious; for it presupposes that Almighty God will care to please all Protestant parents by baptizing their children into the parental faith. In this case it would be the parents—it would not be Almighty God—who would decide upon the faith given in baptism. The natural reason suf-

fices to tell us that, if there be one Sacrament of Baptism, that Sacrament must be the same for all the baptized ; every child must be baptized into the same faith ; so that if one child be baptized into the Anglican faith, all children must be baptized into the Anglican faith ; or if one child be baptized into the Roman faith, all children must be baptized into the Roman faith. The non-Catholic idea of adapting a Divine Sacrament to the private views of every member of every sect is so fantastic that it can scarcely be treated gravely. That a parent should choose a special baptism for his own child—choose the faith “into which he should be baptized”—is putting the parent into the place of Almighty God. Yet it is the commonest thing in England to hear people use such expressions as “baptized into the Protestant faith,” or “baptized into the faith of the Greek Church.” To a Catholic, who apprehends that the Divine unity does not admit of such painfully human variability, such expressions are irreverent—they are shocking.

As then there is one baptism into one faith—not a hundred different baptisms into a hundred faiths—it must follow that he who (wilfully) quits the one faith is no longer a Catholic but a heretic. Happily the immense majority of those who are born out of the Visible Church are not heretics, but are only in “heresy” ; and the majority being baptised they remain members of the Catholic Church until they wilfully place themselves outside it. Of all baptized Protestants it would therefore be true to say that they could be “reunited” to the Catholic Roman Church ; but this is very different from saying that the heresy which they may have cherished can be re-united to the Catholic Roman Faith. The baptized Christian is one thing ; his heresy is another. *He* can be re united “to the faith of this baptism ;” his heresy was never united, never could be. Yet many persons talk of “the re-union of Anglicanism with the possibly-to-be-deformed Roman Faith.” Here is where the great mistake comes in. Falsehood cannot be re-united with truth, because the two never had any previous union ; but penitents can be re-united with the Catholic Church, by the door of the Sacrament of Penance.

So that we come back to submission as the only rational substitute for the fictitious “Reunion of the Churches.” They who have tried submission know what it is—the embrace of the most tender of mothers. They who have not tried it think it must be “humiliating”—as though the kiss of peace from an angel could be humiliating.

If it be true there are no “churches”—in the Protestant sense of the word ; and if it be true that, accurately speaking, there can be no reunion ; it remains that we try to find some more reasonable solution of the state of warfare into which Christendom is

plunged. "A house divided against itself," is not the Christian idea of Christendom; and one of the horrors of this division is that the heathen world is kept waiting for that "reunion" which can alone convert *them*. For their sakes, as well as for our own, we should all strive to be united; for there can be no question that the reason why the whole world is not Christian is because the scandal of divisions makes it impossible. In addition to the huge schisms of Czarodoxy and Anglicanism, America and England between them count nearly five hundred Christianities, each one holding aloof from every other. Well may the heathen say to Protestant missionaries, "Go home, and settle among yourselves what Christianity is, and then come and teach us."

III.

If non-Catholics have accepted the estimate just now hazarded, that "the claim to possess the divine authority to teach truth" is in itself a strong presumption of that possession; they will have easily passed to the corollary, that "the disclaimer of divine authority is in itself a strong presumption of *not* possessing it"; and they will therefore naturally turn to the authority which says, "I *can* teach," and will ask, "Prove to me that you are from heaven and I will obey you." Well might the Catholic Church reply with her Divine Master, "Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me?" But in truth all non-Catholics recognize the truism, that the Catholic Church alone is authoritative. It is *because* she is authoritative that they quarrel with her, alleging that they prefer their private judgment. The question with any Protestant is not, "Is the Catholic Church authoritative?" but, "Is the Catholic Church *divinely* authoritative?" This question we should like to try to answer.

If the Catholic Church be not divinely authoritative, then in what sense can it be said to be authoritative? Remember what it has done. It has through nineteen centuries defined Christian dogma, anathematizing all who disobeyed. Who was it who condemned the Arians, and decreed that the Blessed Virgin was "Mother of God?" Who was it that, instinctively detecting the subtle heresies of such men as Nestorius or Eutyches, defended the true doctrine of the Incarnation, and anathematized all who attacked it? Who was it who replied to Martin Luther's wild heresies by affirming the dogma of transubstantiation; and who was it, in the present century, who replied to the humanness of Protestantism by proclaiming the Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God, and subsequently replied to the mockers of supreme authority by affirming the dogma of infallibility? From the first Council of Jerusalem to the last Council of the Vatican, the Catholic

Roman Church has alone claimed divine authority, has alone exercised the rights of that authority. If then this authority be not divine, what is it? Most certainly it cannot be human. No Christian could believe that a purely human authority had taught nineteen centuries of Christians to adore the Sacramental Presence on the Altar; to submit to the humiliation of confessing their sins before they were permitted to communicate; or to accept a rule of faith, from its very beginning to its very end, under penalty of excommunication.

If all this exercise of divine authority were purely human (to use a paradox which Protestantism has invented) then must the human and the divine be the same thing; for it would follow that the Son of God had given to a human institution the divine power of penetrating divine mysteries, of teaching His whole Church the exact truth upon every doctrine; and of enforcing obedience, under penalty of damnation, to the whole discipline of the whole Catholic life. There is only one escape from this obviously absurd dilemma, and the escape is more disastrous than the dilemma; it is that the Son of God has permitted all Christians to be taught lies (and this too for nearly nineteen centuries) by that very authority which He ordained to teach them truths. In this case the promises of the Son of God to be with His Teaching Church to the end of the world—to guide her into all truth so that the gates of hell should never conquer her—have been broken from the very beginning to the present time, and apparently will be always broken to the Day of Judgment; an “escape” from the dilemma which we prefer to leave to such intelligences as must take as low a view of the Son of God as of His Church. Indeed it were difficult to say whether the impiety or the absurdity of both the dilemma and the escape from the dilemma is more outrageous, more revolting to a Christian mind. If you accept the authority of the Teaching Church as being divine, her whole lifetime, her whole dogmatizing, have been consistent; but if you say that that teaching authority is *not* divine, you have to admit that a purely human institution has usurped the place of the Holy Spirit of God; has taught with most exquisite accuracy the mysteries of the divine mind; binding all men to obey her or to be lost. But is such an hypothesis so much as conceivable; we need not ask, is it reasonable, is it Christian? What! the *only* Teaching Church that ever existed is also the *only* supreme impiety, supreme blasphemy! The *only* Church which for nineteen centuries has said “You must obey”—and which has been obeyed by the enormous majority of all Christians—is also the *only* gigantic fraud for men’s perdition! The *only* Church from which all schismatics and heretics have learned all that they ever knew about Christian

Truth is also the *only* Church which has so incarnated apostacy as to teach lies from the year 1 to 1893! Then away with Christianity from off the earth. So colossal a mistake, so inconceivable a failure, has never been matched in the world's history as the Protestant ideal of the Catholic Church.

But to return to common sense, and to talk as reasonable beings who believe in God and in the Divinity of Jesus Christ; we all know that the Catholic Church has authority, and that that authority must, of necessity, be divine. Knowing this, we also know that the Church must be infallible—that is, cannot be deceived by the Holy Spirit. Infallibility (in regard only to faith and morals) necessarily follows upon the divine commission to teach; for, that God should give a commission to teach, and should make it the Christian's duty to obey, while *not* giving the divine assistance to teach truly, is, in the rational order, an absurdity which is monstrous, and in the supernatural order inconceivable. A divine authority must teach divinely, because it is not a man or men who define truth, but the Holy Spirit, who can neither deceive nor be deceived.

IV,

Such reflections lead us easily to the conclusion that a reunion can mean only a submission; for, *not* to submit to divine authority would be insane; it would be not only wicked, it would be mad. The one question which every Christian has to ask himself, in searching for the answer to "What is truth?" is, "*which* is the divine authority among many authorities?" If there be no divine authority, there is no duty in believing; for no man can invent the Catholic faith for himself, any more than he can obey his own mind. On the other hand, if there *be* a divine authority, all that we have to do is submit to it. We must not talk about reunion, but about submission. God has not placed a divine authority in this world to make compromises with the "views" of various sects, but to teach all men the whole truth unto salvation, and to be obeyed with the whole will, the whole heart.

Doubtless, one reason why so many Protestants mistake the question is, that they mistake the simple scope of Catholic authority. They confuse the purely natural side of the Catholic Church with the supernatural powers of the Divine Teacher—the mere accidents with the essentials of Catholic life. Infallibility refers only to faith and morals—to the two provinces where the human reason by itself must be incompetent to define the divine truths. Catholic authority is infallible as to the truths of God, in so far only as they concern human salvation; beyond that, the supreme Pontiff, or all the bishops assembled in Council, can speak

only with the wise discretion of saintly men. A few weeks ago, a leading High Church newspaper affirmed that the Pope could not be infallible because he had found it prudent to modify his Irish policy in regard to Anglo-Irish complications. If highly-educated Protestants can publish such nonsense, how can we wonder that the "common people" get confused? Yet it would be impossible for any truism to be more simple than that a teaching authority can teach only within its own limits; faith and morals—not politics, nor astronomy, any more than chemistry or botany—being the sole provinces of the teaching Church's infallibility.

To submit, then, to Catholic authority is to submit only upon such subjects as are confessedly beyond the reach of natural knowledge. And surely, this is a perfectly reasonable submission. If we may employ a weak analogy, a man does not go to a physician to learn arithmetic, nor to a chemist to learn music, nor to an opera singer to learn quadratic equation. And it is the most astounding thing in the world, that every Protestant, of every trade, imagines that he was necessarily born a pontiff, competent to decide at any moment on every mystery of faith, and to teach the Church and all the Saints what is truth. Even naturally, such an assumption would be fantastic. But, since the truths of which we are speaking are not natural—or, at the least, are equally supernatural and natural—the claim of every Protestant to be a born pontiff (so infallible as to be able to teach every pontiff) must be dismissed as the wildest folly and self-delusion.

May we not, then, affirm, with perfect confidence, that submission is the only rational attitude for all believers in the divine authority of Christ's Church? We grant at once that if that authority be *not* divine, then reunion is as good a word as submission, yet perhaps enough has been said to show that a Teaching Church must be either divine or it cannot teach. The Protestant theory is: God founded a Christian Church, within whose communion divine truths should be known, yet He purposely withheld from that Church the possibility of being assured as to which were the truths necessary to salvation. He gave authority to a Teaching Church to define dogma, but only on the condition that she should not define it. He ordained sacraments, He ordained priesthood, He ordained powers; yet only on the condition that no Christian should know for certain what was the true or false doctrine as to the sacraments, what was the true method of assuring a true priesthood, what were the powers which should govern the whole Church. He therefore created a divine authority which was not divine; He specified means of salvation which were to be submitted to private judgment; He created a priesthood which was to be judged and ruled by every layman, and He authorized

powers of which every man, woman and child was to be justified in fixing the limits or the impotency. We do not see what use there was in founding an institution of which every affirmative might be negated by every member. If this prominent theory were the right one, and if the Church in the very beginning had been the miserably human failure which Protestantism has warmly approved for three centuries, it is certain that there would never have been any creeds; there would never have been the anathema of any heresy; there would never have been even the possibility of unity; there would only have been free thinking *plus* the historic fact of the life of Christ, and there would have been no Protestantism, because there would have been no Church. The very existence of Protestantism proves the divinity of the Catholic Church; for there must have been dogmatic truth before it could be denied, and there could not have been dogmatic truth without authority. To protest against authority is to admit authority; for the act of protest is the personal assertion of authority, the only difference between the Catholic and the Protestant (in regard to this one question of authority) being that the Catholic says it resides in the teaching Church, whereas the Protestant says it resides in his own person. "One Pontiff" is the theory of every Catholic; "one Pontiff as the Head of the teaching Church." "Every man is his own Pontiff" is the theory of every Protestant; Divine authority to judge of everything and of everybody being lodged in each individual human soul."

V.

Submission may well be distasteful to the Protestant. But how many *real* Protestants are there at this day? Fifty years ago it was possible to be a real Protestant, because the Catholic religion was not in the least understood by even the educated clergy of the Anglican Church. In these days, when the Catholic Church is in the midst of us, it would be impossible that any fairly educated Protestant should not at the least understand its main principles. Those main principles are authority and obedience. The High Church party confess to the principles, but they will not hear of their being logically carried out.

"Authority I admit," says the Ritualist, "but this authority belongs to each National Church, which may approve a national creed, and may enforce it." So that Christianity is a geographical accident. If you happen to be born in London, you must believe in the Thirty-Nine Articles; if Paris should, by a natural accident, be your birthplace, you may call the Thirty-Nine Articles ludicrous heresy; but if Moscow should have the honor of introducing you to Christianity, then you must believe in "The Holy

Synod," in the divine authority of Photius, and in the supreme pontificate of the Czar of all the Russias. So that the map of Europe, not the teaching of the Holy Spirit, is the infallible arbiter of both authority and doctrine. But if it be answered, "No, Anglicanism is the truth *everywhere*," then we have to deplore the inconvenience of the consequence that the Roman Catholic Church is true *nowhere*; so that the huge majority of all Christians, living and dead, are and have been the dupes of the devil instead of being the One Family of God. Either way the theories are absurd. Whether we accept the geographical theory of authority, which changes truth with the climate or with conquests, or accept the theory of the alone Anglican verity, which makes nineteen-twentieths of all Christians to have been heretics—and these heretics the only Christians who have been united—we have to accept an absurdity which, if men's minds were not accustomed to it, would make every Christian child to shout, "Folly!" And the Christian child, if he heard mention of "Reunion" between the one Divine authority and the human religions, would say, "No, not reunion, but submission; not compromise, but obedience to authority."

It is talking platitudes to affirm that divine truths can be defined only by an authority which itself is supernatural; and that obedience of mind and heart, in matters of divine faith can be rendered only to the Representative of God. And it is talking wildly to affirm that two or more divine authorities can be commissioned by the same Almighty God to teach "truths" which contradict one another, or to divinely rebuke each other's heresies. Why reason upon what has no reason in it? The "escape" which some Protestants think they find from a dilemma which both rationally and spiritually is unbearable is in the assertion that "it is not upon essentials that the churches or the sects are divided." They forget that it is upon the very question "What is essential, what is not essential"; that the innumerable churches, the innumerable sects are divided. If the divisions are not upon "essentials," there can be no apology, no excuse, for the myriad schisms; and if the divisions *are* upon essentials, the position is conceded for which we are now contending, that divine authority can alone determine the question. Since then, without a divine authority, we cannot know "what is essential, what is not essential," it follows that such divine authority must exist, or there can be no difference between the essential and the non-essential. Yet no Protestant would affirm this last postulate. It follows therefore that there is a divine authority. And since it has been proved that no Protestant "Church" possesses it, it follows that the Catholic Church is the sole divine authority upon this earth for the determining the essential and the non-essential.

“Christianity,” it has often been urged, “cannot be reduced to a syllogism.” No, that is true; but Catholicity can be vindicated by common sense. Suppose that you were to put the question to an intelligent pagan who had never heard of the existence of Christianity: “If God should send His Son to this world, to live and die to teach us divine truths, would he be likely to ordain that there should be *no* living authority who should interpret His revealed Truths through the ages?” The intelligent pagan would reply, “What then would be the use of the Revelation; since it is certain that the human intellect by itself could not define a large number of divine truths, whether that human intellect were colossal and highly cultured, or the mere average intelligence of the vast multitude.” And the intelligent pagan might continue, “The very fact of a Revelation of a number of divine truths prove that all those truths were superhuman; and since the acceptance of all those truths—not of one truth, but of all truths—through all ages, by all men, women, and children, would become intellectually and morally obligatory, common sense tells me that there would be a living divine authority to command obedience through twenty centuries of human resistance; and not only to command obedience but to punish by excommunication all who dared to oppose their judgment to one single truth.” And then if you should proceed to put before the intelligent pagan the whole picture of the battling Protestant schisms, and should ask him his opinion about reunion, he would probably reply that he did not understand the question, for to his mind the submission of the disobedient must precede the request to be united. *His* common sense, unperverted by heresies, would grasp the case intuitively and as a matter of course; for he would apprehend that the divine mind, having established a divine authority would not admit of any compromises or discussions.

Yet we cannot wonder that non-Catholics, who have been brought up to obey themselves—to take themselves for their final arbiter in matters of faith—should find it difficult to realize the attitude of the Catholic mind, which insists upon a divine authority in divine matters. Let us consider for a moment the Protestant attitude, so that we may realize its difficulty, its great effort. The Protestant has always regarded private judgment as not only his privilege but his duty; so that his idea of “religious liberty” has been the liberty of choosing a *credo* out of the whole scope of religious opinionism. He has always regarded dogma as of human creation; not as the infallible ruling of divine authority, but as a sort of authoritative consensus of a few clergy. Indeed dogma is very like an Act of Parliament, in the sense in which Protestants understand it; it is a human decree, not regarded as immutable,

but as a convenient and useful formula for order's sake ; so that to exalt dogma into the dignity of a divine certainty would be like exalting an act of Parliament into a divine law. This low estimate of the whole domain of Christian dogma has generated a low estimate of obedience ; for why should a man obey a human dogma, save as he obeys an admittedly fallible act of Parliament, which may be altered next year, perhaps repealed? And as in the case of obedience to dogmatic verities, so in the case of submission to Catholic Authority. If the dogma be uncertain it must be because the authority is uncertain, and submission to an authority which is uncertain can only be rendered with uncertainty. Such a submission would be submission to a temporary law, not to the eternal divine wisdom ; the authority being fallible because it is human—not infallible because guided by God. Hence submission in the Protestant mind, to Catholic authority seems like a sort of idolatry rendered to men ; the idea being that Catholic authority is a *usurpation* of Divine authority, not an authority which was established by the Most High. And if the Protestant theory were true that the authority of the Catholic Church were the authority of human beings—bishops or priests—or were the authority of this or that human pontiff, Protestants would be quite right in regarding obedience and submission as conditional on their own estimate of human teachers. Since, however, the Catholic principle is that, in regard to faith and morals, God Himself teaches the Church through His rulers, it necessarily follows that Catholic obedience, Catholic submission, are not made to men but to God. Faith and morals belong to God, not to man ; nor could any man who ever lived decree a dogma, if the decree issued from human penetration, it is the Holy Spirit guiding His Church into all truths, who alone decrees dogmas of faith and morals ; and therefore, obedience to them, submission to them, are not humiliating, but are the most sweet and dignifying exercise of human intellect.

Why, then, not submit to Catholic authority? All Protestants whether they be Churchmen or Dissenters, are bewailing their ceaseless strifes and variations. In America as in England, the gravest of non-Catholics have expressed their ardent desire for conciliation. Schemes have been proposed ; congresses have been assembled ; bishops and clergy have drawn up "Certain Points of Agreement ;" and though such experiments have come to naught, still every earnest-minded man says, "If it be possible, let us strive after reunion." The sole mistake of such admirable wishes or aspirations is in the not recognizing that there *must* be submission. Why wish for so-called reunion, save because truth cannot be divided ; and since there can only be one true Church why not submit to it, instead of wasting years in futile talk? Mil-

lions of Protestants live and die outside the Visible Church, deprived of all the marvellous riches of her spiritual life, as well as of the exquisite enjoyments of her serenity, because they will not submit instead of speculating ; will not obey, instead of inventing a thousand excuses. And so death comes, with no Last Sacraments, no Last Blessing, no Requiem, no Invocation, no Indulgences, the naked soul being sent forth alone on its Protestant journey, without one supernatural aid or consolation. Yet one moment's submission would do it all ! "I submit," even said interiorly, and with full intention, would unite the soul with the one Catholic Church. And then would follow conditional baptism ; the first enjoyment of a true confession ; the first true communion ; the first true confirmation ; the admission into the Communion of Saints ; the absolute certainty of a perfect faith and perfect worship ; with an end forever of all Protestant doubt and human opinion, with all their necessarily accompanying heartaches and humiliations. "I submit" is the grandest exercise of the human will ; for it lifts up the intellect to union with God—to the most sublime realization of the eternal wisdom.

ARTHUR F. MARSHALL.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGES: THEIR ORIGIN AND THEIR METHODS.

[Apart from its own intrinsic value, this article has a peculiar interest, owing to the fact that it is one of the last, if not the very last, emanations from the fruitful pen of the late highly gifted and deeply lamented Brother Azarias. The present article is only the first part of a paper which, because of its length, has been divided into two articles, of which the following is the first. The second we will publish in the next number of the REVIEW.—EDITOR.]

1. *Abelard and the Origin and Early History of Universities.* By Gabriel Compayré. New York. 1893.
2. *La Sorbonne, ses Origines et sa Bibliothèque.* Par Alfred Franklin. Paris. 1875.
3. *The University of Cambridge, from the Earliest Times to the Royal Injunctions of 1535.* By J. Bass Mullinger. Cambridge. 1873.
4. *A History of the University of Oxford, from the Earliest Times to the Year 1530.* By H. C. Maxwell Lyte. London. 1886.
5. *De Studiis Literariis Mediolanensium.* Auctore Joseph Antonio Saxis. Milan. 1729.

I.

M. COMPAYRÉ concludes the preface to his new volume in the following words: "I trust also, that the literary dictionaries of the future, if they should grant me a place in their pages, will have the goodness when they mention my name to follow it with this notice: Gabriel Compayré, a French writer, whose least mediocre work, translated into English before being printed, was published in America." We shall add to this notice: The book of which M. Compayré seems to be so proud is called "Abelard," and yet all that the author has to say about Abelard is confined to twenty-five pages. The book really covers the same ground as Mr. Laurie's work, "The Rise and Constitution of Universities," and is therefore misnamed. The title suggested a subject upon which the author might have made a particularly bright book. Abelard's life, his teachers, his contemporaries, the schools in which he studied, the schools in which he taught, his pupils and his disciples, his doctrines, his methods, his persecutions, his influence—here is matter enough for so many interesting chapters, in which the author need not go over precisely the same ground so well tilled by the classic work of M. Remusat. This is the kind of book we had a right to expect from the title. And we fail to see the intimate connection between Abelard and the University of Paris which the author would establish. Abelard is in no sense its founder. He was to no greater extent its forerunner than was his teacher, William of Champeaux. Abelard was a brilliant meteor who crossed

the welkin of the twelfth century, throwing around him a lurid glare, awaking minds and creating excitement; restless, active, superficial, pretentious, bold, with sharpened intellect and a perennial flow of language. But in no sense can the university be traced to him. Had he never lived the university would have grown into corporate existence scarce a day later. There were scholastic disputations before his day; he may have systematized them more than formerly, but he did not create them. His learning was not at all commensurate with his fame.

M. Compayré may be a good professor; he certainly is not an apt scholar. When in 1877 he wrote the first book that brought him into notoriety—“*Histoire Critique des Doctrines de l’Éducation en France depuis le Seizième Siècle*”—he showed no less a decided proclivity to draw from sources that confirmed his prejudices, than great repugnance towards any authority at all favorable to the school or the system he would condemn. This method of quotation at second-hand led him into very questionable company. He accepted information from sources the most valueless, and in consequence was led into blunders that would shame a schoolboy. Witness the following assertion concerning the Jesuits: “In metaphysics they suppress some of the questions the most interesting and the most essential, as for instance, all that regards the existence of God and the nature of His attributes.”¹ How came M. Compayré to make this statement? He found a misrepresenting translation of the “Constitutions and Declarations” of the Jesuits with a hostile appendix, containing garbled extracts from the rules of this distinguished body, and among others, he read these words: *In metaphysica questiones de Deo et Intelligentiis prætereantur*. Now in a footnote M. Compayré avers that he has before him two complete editions of the “Ratio Studiorum.” Had he opened either of them, he would have found a prohibition to touch upon those questions concerning God and His angels in metaphysical discussions, which depend wholly or in great measure upon revelation, and which therefore belong to the domain of faith.² Péré Daniel called his attention to this and other blunders only little less glaring.³

Now, to what degree has M. Compayré profited by this lesson? Let the reader judge from the following extract: “Thomas Aquinas had composed the ‘*De regimine principum*,’ and the ‘*De cruditione principum*.’ His disciple, Gilles de Rome, Archbishop of Bruges, who was tutor to Philip the Fair, also followed Aristotle

¹ *Hist. Crit.*, t. i., p. 196.

² *In Metaphysica, questiones de Deo et Intelligentiis, quæ omnino aut magnopere pendunt ex veritatibus divina fide traditis, prætereantur*; *Reg. Prof. Phil.*, p. 71; *Ratio Studiorum*, ed. 1606.

³ *Les Jésuites Instituteurs de la Jeunesse Française*. 1880.

in politics."¹ True it is that both the volumes here named are to be found among the collected works of the Angelical Doctor, but it is generally conceded that only two books of the first-named have been written by Thomas, while the latter work is now universally attributed to the pen of Peraldus, or William of Pérault. Where has M. Compayré picked up the information here so loosely expressed? Surely not from the works themselves, nor from any respectable account of them. Even the '*Histoire Littéraire de la France*' loosely written as it is in regard to these books, would have enlightened the author and guided his pen to greater accuracy. Later on, we shall refer to them for another purpose than to express a platitude about the "Politics" of Aristotle. There is not a clause or phrase in the paragraph from which we quote that does not betray complete ignorance of the subject treated.

Now, why will M. Compayré to day, as sixteen years ago, accept such inferior material and impose it on his readers as something worthy of their intelligence? After the wholesome lesson of Père Daniel one would think that he would be more cautious. It is just such paragraphs as this that render M. Compayré's book unworthy of a permanent place in literature and undeserving of the niche he so modestly looks for. However, the author could not write an altogether worthless book, nor could he be dull if he tried. And when one begins to realize that one is reading a book not on Abelard, but on the mediæval universities, one finds much to admire and commend in the sketch. The style is picturesque and brilliant; the outline is clearly traced; the whole subject is cleverly handled. One is enabled to form a fair conception of mediæval university life from a perusal of the book. In this regard and to this extent may the book be commended. The ordinary reader may not observe the note of triumph with which the author records every step towards the secularization of the university; he may pass over the antipathy to celibacy that is evinced through the pages of the little work; he may forget that the author has overlooked, or treated inadequately, the influence of the religious orders upon university-life — and when he has finished the perusal of the book, it may never occur to him that the very elements which the author ignores or belittles are the soul of the universities. With the extinction of these elements began the decay of the universities.

II.

Turn we now to university college-life. It brings us a step nearer to modern school-life. With the advance of the thirteenth century lawlessness grew more and more among university stu-

¹ *Abelard*, p. 290.

dents. They were imposed upon, in spite of ordinance and statute, by the townspeople with whom they boarded; they were frequently in the hands of Jews paying exorbitant interest on moneys loaned; they were daily exposed to become the victims of lewd men and women who were continually on the watch for new victims. Theirs was in many instances a life of hardships that was sustained chiefly by the buoyancy of youth and an insatiable thirst for knowledge. In the meantime, the regular clergy had schools of order and discipline in which youths were well cared for and jealously shielded from the trials and temptations that were constantly assailing the student quartered upon the town. The shining lights of their respective orders lectured in the university and attracted around them youths who from admiring their professors came to love their life of peace and quiet and religious discipline, and ultimately sought admission as members. These youths were generally of bright promise and good family. And so, Carmelite and Augustinian, Franciscan and Dominican—especially the last two—gathered into their novitiates the flower of mediæval youth. Men at one time dreaded sending their sons to Oxford lest they should become friars. In 1358 it was enacted that if any mendicant friar shall induce or cause to be induced any member of the university under 18 years of age to join the said friars, or shall in any way assist at their abduction, no graduate belonging to the cloister or society of which such friar is a member, shall be permitted to give or attend lectures in Oxford or elsewhere for the ensuing year.¹ Richard Fitzralph, Archbishop of Armagh, who bore the friars no more love than did his disciple, John Wyclif, tells how the friars of Oxford carried off an Englishman's son, then under thirteen years, and how the father was not permitted to speak to his boy except in the presence of the friars. The father was then in Avignon, bringing the case to the notice of the Pope.² But long before this note of alarm was sounded religious cloisters were the only havens of security amid the turmoil of university life.

Not that the need of safeguarding the student was not felt by the authorities, but all the universities in their early days were poor. Neither Paris nor Oxford up to the middle of the thirteenth century possessed a building that it could call its own. The schools and halls were rented, or were granted by the religious orders, or even by the townspeople. The official dinners of the Masters of Arts were given at the common taverns of the town. So, at Oxford in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the Faculty of Arts used to assemble in the Church of St. Mil-

¹ *Munimenta Academica*, i., p. 205. This statute was afterwards repealed. Cooper, *Annals*, i., p. 109.

² Lyte, *A History of the University of Oxford*, p. 174.

dred, while degrees were granted and other secular business was, by sufferance, transacted in the Church of St. Mary the Virgin.¹ Still, even at the dawn of university-life, we discern traces of efforts made to assist and protect poor youth. There is a tradition that the Danish College was established as early as 1030, with endowment for one hundred and thirty poor clerks. In 1187, Robert de Dreux, brother of Louis VII. of France, founded in Paris a house of prayer and a house of studies under the patronage of St. Thomas of Canterbury. Again, we read that in 1180, Joce, of London, on his return from Jerusalem endowed a room in the Hotel Dieu, in which eighteen students might be lodged. The college was afterwards transferred to the square of Notre Dame, still retaining its name of Maison des Dix-Huits.² The primary object of these and similar institutions was simply to afford shelter and protection to the scholars. There was no intention of making them institutions of learning. Indeed, we may trace their beginning to the hostel in which certain licensed masters were wont to keep students at moderate terms. "The hostel of the English universities in former times," says Mullinger, "may be defined as a lodging house under the rule of a principal, whose students resided at their own cost. . . . It offered no pecuniary aid, but simply freedom from extortion, and a residence where quiet would be ensured and some discipline enforced; advantages, however, of no small rarity in that turbulent age."³ These hostels or inns were comparatively few and wholly inadequate for the numbers that flocked to the universities. It was but in the beginning of the fifteenth century that Oxford was in condition to forbid clerks from lodging in the houses of laymen.⁴

In the meantime, it became evident that, while the mendicant orders were flourishing and absorbing the best talent in the universities both among masters and students, the secular clergy were decaying. How else could it be considering the dangers to which youths were exposed upon their entrance into university life? Take those who flocked to Paris. They were badly lodged and and poorly fed; their clothes and books were exposed to pillage; usually, at an early stage of their entry into Paris, they were relieved of their money. In spite of the vigilance of the officers of the nation under which their names were inscribed, they were cheated, robbed, imposed upon at every turn. The townspeople regarded them as legitimate prey.⁵ Designing men and women pursued them, and set snares for them, and made them victims of

¹ Lyte, *A History of the University of Oxford*, p. 98.

² Lebeuf, *Histoire de la Ville et tout le Diocèse de Paris*, t. ii., pp. 129, 130.

³ *The University of Cambridge*, i., p. 217.

⁴ Lyte, *A History of the University of Oxford*, p. 69.

⁵ Ch. Jourdain, *Excursions à travers le moyen âge*, p. 249.

their wives, till the last penny was extracted. Many a fond father, in his desire to see an apt son become a learned clerk on the road to preferment and distinction, impoverished his family that the favored son might have sufficient means to live in Paris, only to find that son return one day rich in well-bought experience, but poor in all else. Rutebeuf describes such a typical young man. His father sells some of the patrimony in order to equip him for the university. The youth goes to Paris, falls into bad company, is soon rid of all that he had brought with him—even his ambition to study—and his “money gone and his clothes worn out, he has to start life anew.”

“Partout regarde, partout muze,
Ces argens faut et sa robe uze;
Or tout est à recoumancier.”¹

III.

Such experiences set men thinking. Why could not the poor youths struggling under so many difficulties to enter the secular priesthood find some of that shelter and care that was so lavishly bestowed upon the candidates for religious life? This question occupied the mind of Robert Sorbon, the pious and learned confessor to Louis IX. In 1256, with the assistance of the saintly king and of several wealthy ecclesiastics about the court, he founded an institution in which youths aspiring to the secular priesthood might be housed and fed and their studies superintended. This institution was from the beginning especially designed for a nursery of theology. Burses were established for sixteen students, four from each nation. These youths led a life of economy and regularity. Everything in and about the house was poor. “Poverty,” says Crevier, “was the peculiar attribute of the house of Sorbonne, and for a long time it preserved the reality with the title.”² Under royal sanction and papal blessing the institution flourished, and when Robert died, in 1274, the Sorbonne had already become the headquarters of the faculty of theology.³

The regulations that Robert drew up and applied during the twenty years that he governed the institution prove his wisdom and practical good sense. They remained in vogue until in 1790 the Sorbonne went under in the catastrophe of that year. Robert established a preparatory school, and the students were admitted to the college only after receiving their bachelor's degree, maintaining a thesis called after the founder, a Robertine, and obtaining a

¹ *Li Diz de l'Universitei de Paris*, t. i., p. 185. The same experiences are still bought at the same price. See Alphonse Daudet's *Sappho*.

² *Histoire de l'Université de Paris*, i., pp. 494, 495.

³ A. F. Franklin, *La Sorbonne*, p. 16.

majority of votes after three ballotings. There were two classes of members—the guests and the fellows. The guests—*hospites*—were provided with every facility for study, but they took no part in the administration of the house. They were permitted to study in the library, but were not entrusted with the key. They were obliged to leave, in order to give place to others, as soon as they had received the doctor's degree. The fellows—*socii*—had more privileges. They shared in the administration of affairs. Absolute equality reigned among them. Those who were rich paid to the establishment a sum equivalent to the amount received by the bursars. The prior was chosen from among the youngest fellows, and he remained one year in charge. From amongst the most ancient four seniors were chosen. Their duty was to manage difficult affairs and maintain ancient customs. The fellows met once a month to discuss all matters of administration. Robert placed the Sorbonne under the patronage of the Blessed Virgin Mary, but from the fourteenth century we find its patron saint to have been St. Ursula.¹

The pious founder appreciated the value of a good library in those days when books were scarce and expensive. "He was careful," we are told, "to collect in his college all books necessary for theologians and to instal a library."² At his death he bequeathed to the college all his books, including the splendid folio Bible inscribed in 1270 and supposed to have been presented to him by Louis IX.³ In 1289 the library was properly organized. It was divided into two parts. One was called the large library—*magna libraria*—and included the works which were the most frequently made use of; these were chained, and rare and exceptional were the occasions when it was permitted to remove them. The other part was called the little library—*parva libraria*—and contained all duplicates and works rarely consulted, which might be loaned upon a deposit of a certain sum of money or any article of sufficient value to cover the cost of the book. In 1290 the whole library contained 1017 volumes, among which is the "Romance of the Rose," the only book in French mentioned. A beautiful feature of charity in those days was the bequeathing of libraries for the use of poor students. Thus we read that Gerard d'Abbeville, in 1270, bequeathed not only to the students of the Sorbonne but to all lettered seculars his theological works. In the following year, Stephen, Archbishop of Canterbury, left his books to the Church of Notre Dame with the intention that they be placed at

¹ Lebeuf, *Histoire de la Ville et du Diocèse de Paris*, t. i., pp. 240, *sqq.*

² Lad vocat, *Dictionnaire Historique*, Art. Sorbon.

³ This is now No. 15,467 among the MSS. fonds Latin, in the Bibliothèque Nationale.

the disposition of poor scholars who should find use for them in pursuing their studies."

The counsels that Robert left the students were no less valuable. They were unearthed not many years ago, and as they throw light upon college-life in that day it may not be amiss to condense them: "The scholar," he says, "who would study with profit should observe the following rules: first, to dedicate a certain hour to a specific piece of reading; secondly, to fix attention upon what he is about to read, and not to pass lightly to something else. 'There is,' says St. Bernard, 'the same difference between reading and studying as exists between a host and a friend, between a greeting exchanged on the street and an unalterable affection.' Thirdly, to extract each day from our reading some thought, some grain of truth, and to engrave it on the memory with special care; fourthly, to write out an epitome of what one has read, for the words not confined to writing fly like dust before the wind; fifthly, to confer with one's companions in the disputations or in familiar conversation. This practice is even of greater service than reading, because it results in clearing up all doubts and the obscurities that may have remained after reading, *Nihil perfecti scitur, nisi dente disputationis feriatur*; sixthly, to pray. In point of fact, prayer is one of the best means of learning. St. Bernard teaches that reading should excite the affections of the soul, and that it should be a means of elevating the heart to God without interrupting study." This pious doctor cautions young men against wasting their time upon trifles. His words throw light upon one of the greatest weaknesses of mediæval university life. "Certain scholars," he says, "act like fools. They put forth great subtlety in trifles and prove themselves void of intelligence in important matters. In order to make it appear that they have not lost their time, they form thick volumes of parchment filled with blank pages and have them covered in elegant red skin binding. They afterwards return to the paternal roof with a sackful of science that can be stolen by robbers, devoured by rats and worms, or destroyed by fire or water." With his eye upon that class of students who do not put their knowledge to good use he also says: "Grammar forges the sword of the Word of God; rhetoric polishes it; finally, theology makes use of it. Some there are who unceasingly learn to make that sword, to sharpen its edges, and by dint of whetting to wear it all away. Others keep it entirely confined to its scabbard; when they would draw it forth they find that they have grown old, the iron has rusted, and they can no longer effect anything. As for those who study solely with the intention of reaching high places

¹ Franklin, *La Vie Privée d'Autrefois*, p. 84.

in the Church, they are greatly deceived, for they scarcely ever attain the objects of their ambition."¹ These counsels were solid and timely. They left their impress upon the college. A certain number of doctors applied themselves exclusively to the solution of cases of conscience. With practice came skill, and in the course of time people from all parts of Europe were wont to send delicate cases for solution, and thus did the Sorbonne come to be regarded as the greatest authority in Christendom in solving moral problems. It was consulted by king and Pope.

During the latter half of the thirteenth century, colleges multiplied. In 1262, Walter de Merton, then Lord Chancellor of England under Henry III., obtained a license to assign certain manors for the maintenance of clerks studying in the schools of Oxford.² His main object was to secure for the secular priesthood the academical benefits which the religious orders were so largely enjoying. "He borrowed from the monastic institutions the idea of an aggregate body living by common rule, under a common head, provided with all things needful for a corporate and perpetual life, fed by its secured endowments, fenced from all external interference, except that of its lawful patron."³ Thus was Merton the first to achieve for the secular priesthood in Oxford what Robert of Sorbon succeeded in doing for the same order in Paris. The motives actuating these founders were the same; the regulations enforced are alike in many details. At Merton, as in the Sorbonne, the students were to be thoroughly grounded in the liberal arts and in philosophy before being permitted to study theology or canon law. Theology is the main object of the foundation of Merton as well as of the Sorbonne; but in Merton a few were permitted to study canon law and as much civil law as was needed to throw light upon the canons. Poor boys of the founder's kin, to the number of thirteen, received a free preliminary education in which they were to be qualified for scholarships. "While he provides for a good liberal education, and a general grounding in all subsidiary knowledge, he jealously guards his main object of theological study both from being attempted too early by the half-educated boy, and from being abandoned too soon for the temptations of something more profitable."⁴ It is designed that one of the fellows shall make a special study of grammar, that he shall devote himself expressly to that subject, "that he shall be provided with all the necessary books, and shall regularly instruct the younger

¹ *Bibl. Nat. MS. Lat.*, 15,971, fol. 197, sgg.; Le Coy de la Marche, *Le Treizième Siècle*, pp. 50-52.

² Lyte, *A History of Oxford University*, p. 73.

³ Edmund, Bishop of Nelson, *Sketch of the Life of Walter de Merton*, p. 22.

⁴ Bishop of Nelson, *Life of Walter de Merton*, p. 22.

students, while the more advanced students are to have the benefit of his assistance when occasion may require."¹

Other portions of the statutes were evidently inspired by monastic rules. Each scholar was subjected to a year's probation before becoming a permanent member of the society.² A spirit of fellowship and equality was cultivated. The students wore a uniform. All dined and supped together while one of them read an edifying book in Latin. They had a share in government and management. The eldest in a dormitory was known as the dean, and presided at the rising and retiring. Three of the fellows acted as bursars, and five as auditors of accounts. Three times a year there was a general scrutiny of conduct, when the behavior of each inmate was minutely examined and all grievances were ventilated. Should any scholar accept a benefice or enter a religious order, he was obliged to vacate his place.³ All were required to attend the commemorations of benefactors three times a year.

In 1280 the bequest left by William of Durham, was employed to establish University Hall, and other benefactions enabled the Hall to own a library from which books might be borrowed. The discipline of this foundation was severe. Disputations were held in the house as well as in the schools. No book was lent out of the house without a deposit of more value than the book, and the consent of all the scholars. The scholars were allowed to use a common seal. It was enjoined upon them to live honestly as clerks, in a manner befitting saints, not fighting, not using scurrilous or foul language, not reciting; singing or willingly hearing songs or tales of an amatory or indecent character, not taunting or provoking one another to anger, and not shouting so as to disturb the studies or repose of the industrious.⁴ The statutes of Baliol, given in 1282, breathe the same spirit, and no doubt were suggested by the Franciscan confessor of Dervoguilla. The principal was elected by the scholars from among themselves. The scholars were to attend lectures daily and hold fortnightly disputations in their own house. They were to attend services in the parish church on Sundays and hear the sermon. If the weekly allowance were not sufficient the richer scholars were levied upon to make up the deficiency, and should any grumble, they were expelled. The food that remained after a meal was to be given to some poor scholars.⁵

The Sorbonne in Paris and Merton in Oxford were the types after which all mediæval colleges were erected. But it took three hundred years to mature the collegiate system. It was only about

¹ Mullinger, *The University of Cambridge*, i., p. 168.

² *Statutes*, Ed. Percival, p. 20.

³ Lyte, *Hist. Oxford*, p. 78.

⁴ *Munimenta Academica*, Statutes of William of Durham, i., pp. 56-61.

⁵ Lyte, 2, 86.

1550 that it became predominant. The college of Walter de Merton was for some time looked upon with suspicion, as a dangerous experiment. In the meantime, there were established boarding-houses for students having no burses, but able to pay their way. Laymen at first rented chambers from the rector of the university, and prepared some students in private. Finding the practice lucrative, they enlarged their field of operations. These houses became very numerous and were known as pedagogics. They were encouraged and were considered far better than the miserable, dingy, close ill-ventilated holes and dens into which students were thrust by the townspeople in various parts of the city. But with time the keepers of the pedagogics abused their position. They neglected the moral and religious training of the youths confided to them, regarding them as simply so many sources of income. Gerson accused these men of crass ignorance, negligence and immorality. Through fear of losing their pupils they would not correct and punish them. They took no pains to form their boarders to practices of piety and decorum. These youths were as great strangers to the doctrines of Christianity as pagans themselves; they behaved badly in church, even to the extent of annoying the preacher by interruptions, mockeries, hisses and whisperings.¹ Cardinal d'Estouteville when reforming the University of Paris, was severe upon this class of men. He forbade them to run to the inns and taverns in order to recruit their houses, and he would have them cease speculating upon the food and accommodations of the students, ruling at the same time "that they ask only a just and moderate price for provisions according to their kind and season, and that the food be served up clean and wholesome."² In the later organization of the university we distinguish three classes of students. 1. There were the students boarding outside; two usually occupying the same room, and frequently the same bed. These were known as *martinets*—the *chamberdekyns* of Oxford—and were looked after by the regents. 2. There were the students under the pedagogues; these were called *camerists*. 3. There were the college students who boarded with the principal and were known simply as boarders. Those elderly students who passed from school to school and from branch to branch, seeming to have no definite aim in pursuing their studies—and indeed no other aim in life than to live and die students of the university—shiftless fellows without the ambition of excelling in anything—were called *galoches*.³ In England, as the number of colleges increased the hotels declined, and were either merged in the colleges or disused.⁴

¹ *Opera*, t. i., p., 110. Letter written about the year 1400.

² Du Boulay, *Hist. Univ. Paris*, t. v., p. 572.

³ Etienne Pasquier, *Recherches sur la France*, liv. ix., chap. xvii.

⁴ Robert Potts, *Liber Cantabrigiensis*, p. 177.

IV.

Although the collèges were at first regarded with suspicion, still as their numbers increased they became the object of special solicitude on the part of the university authorities. In Paris, the rector was in duty bound to visit each college at least once a month. After the 17th century, when the university was losing all hold upon the colleges, these visits became less frequent. But when they did occur they were made the occasion of great rejoicings for the students. "If the rector enters a college," says Pasquier, "there is no telling the joy with which he is welcomed and the acclamations with which he is received, evidences of the honor and respect in which he is held."¹ On these occasions the rector made his visitation in state, walking through the city clothed in his scarlet cloak, preceded by two bedels bearing silver maces, and followed by masters in arts marching two by two in procession.

Cardinal d'Estouteville, in 1452, empowered the rector to convoke the four nations in order to elect four regents to whom he might delegate this mission of visiting the colleges, inns, and pedagogics, and whose duty it was to ascertain the morals, discipline, teaching, and food of each, and with the aid of the bishop to reform whatever called for reformation.²

It were a long and tedious task to trace the story of the relations of the colleges with their university. Suffice it to say that these colleges were established rather as places in which poor scholars were supplied with board and lodging than as schools for purposes of instruction. The principal at first conducted the students to the lecture hall of the professor, and led them back to the college in a body. Here, with the aid of assistants, he superintended their studies, started disputations, occasionally heard the scholars recite, and thus profitably filled that portion of the day which was not spent in attending lectures. But seeing that this passing to and fro was an occasion of disorder and entailed considerable loss of time, the masters, as soon as students became numerous enough, at first privately lectured in the colleges. These lectures afterwards became recognized by the university authorities. "We do not exactly know," says Du Boulay, "when this practice began; it is generally thought that the College of Navarre, which was reformed in the year 1464, was the first to open its gates to these public professors of letters."³

And so these institutions grew from their first lowly and unpretentious beginning to be themselves centres of light. Their daily

¹ *Recherches sur la France*, liv. ix., chap. 22, t. i., p. 937.

² Bulaeus, *Hist. Univ. Par.*, t. v., p. 570.

³ *Hist. Univ. Par.*, in *loc. cit.*

regulation will give clearer insight into college life than could a lengthy description :

At 4 o'clock, rising. The students were awakened by a member of the philosophy class, who went around the dormitory to arouse those who gave a deaf ear to the bell, and to light the candles at the season when candles were needed.

At 5, the same member saw that the scholars were placed in order around the halls. During the hour from 5 to 6 the regents gave their first lesson.

At 6 o'clock, breakfast, which consisted of a small piece of bread. After breakfast there was rest, but no recreation.

From 8 to 10, the principal lesson of the morning.

From 10 to 11, discussion and argumentation.

At 11, dinner, accompanied by reading of the Bible or lives of the saints. The chaplain said the prayers before and after meals, made mementoes of benefactors, and added thereto pious exhortations. The principal took up the word, gave admonitions, distributed praise or blame among the students, and announced the punishments and corrections determined upon the evening previous.

From 12 to 2, revision and interrogation regarding the morning's lessons.

From 2 to 3, repose, when there was public reading of some poet or orator—*ne diabolus hominem inveniat otiosum*.

From 3 to 5, the principal lesson of the afternoon.

From 5 to 6, discussion and argumentation upon the lesson just attended.

At 6, supper.

At 6 30, questionings upon the lessons of the day.

At 7 30, complin and benediction.

At 8 in winter and 9 in summer, bed-time.

Masters and pupils authorized to do so might keep the candle burning till 11 o'clock. The wild and unrestrained manners of the students became softened by theatrical representations within the colleges, and by outdoor sports and promenades. In the afternoons of Tuesdays and Thursdays the students were given free time, when they were permitted to walk to the Près-aux-clercs. Long promenades into the country were made with great pomp and ceremony. Besides the Landit, there were certain annual ones that were carefully observed. Such were the promenades of Notre Dame des Vignes, Notre Dame des Champs, and a grand promenade in May, when the students, upon their return, assembled before the door of the rector and there planted a tree. From the regulations here given there were variations. Thus, in the College of St. Barbe, free time was given only after the principal lesson of the afternoon had been gone through.¹ In other schools the whole of Thursday was given to recreation.² Feast days were numerous, but they were not idled away. They were passed in devotions and in studies outside the university programme, according to the taste of each student. No leave of absence was granted upon feast days. An often-mooted question was what constituted servile

¹ J. Quicherat, *Histoire du Collège de Sainte Barbe*, t. i., ch. x., pp. 83 sqq.

² Noël du Fail, *Oeuvres*, t. ii., p. 186.

work for a student on Sunday. Durand de Champagne, in the beginning of the fourteenth century, decided that scholars were not permitted to make complete copies of their notes, nor to hire out their labor by transcribing for others, but they might enter notes of lessons to preserve the memory of them, as well as of sermons taken down with the stylus.¹ The students were allowed to go home during the month of September. This period was the vintage-time—*les vendanges*. The term "vacation" was confined to the three summer months, during which the superior courses and examinations of the university were suspended.

The tuition in the colleges was a variable quantity, and was regulated according to certain statutes of the university. It depended greatly upon the vintage and harvest. Each year it was definitely fixed by the rector, the deans of the four faculties, the principals of the colleges, and two Parisian merchants.² Another statute authorized the professors to receive from each scholar, without the exacting or naming of any amount on their part, five or six gold crowns towards the end of the school-year.³ In the month of June, during the feast of Lendit, each scholar offered his regent a lemon, upon the rind of which the golden crowns were arranged, the whole being placed in a crystal vase filled with sweetmeats.⁴ At one time the pupils of the whole school, supplied with this offering, marched in great pomp to the playing of fife and the beating of tambourine, and with formal ceremony presented it to the regents; but the custom was abolished in 1600.⁵

Few of the masters and regents were overburdened with wealth. The colleges, with rare exceptions, retained the primitive spirit in which they were established. They continued to be sheltering schools for poor youths, conducted under the auspices of religion, and the impress of poverty remained stamped upon their rules, the food given and the customs handed down. Mr. Lyte, speaking of Oxford, says: "In its corporate capacity, the University was undoubtedly poor, and it had scarcely any funds applicable for general purposes."⁶ The principal and his assistants, in many of the Parisian schools, lived on a pittance of three or four sous a week, and were obliged to resort to other means to eke out a living. When Sir Thomas More, through reverse of fortune, found himself obliged to economize, he wrote to his wife: "But my counsel is that we fall not to the lowest fare first; we will not, therefore, descend to Oxford fare." Oxford fare was the type of poor living.

¹ *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, vol. xxx., p. 302.

² *Statutes*, art. 67.

³ *Statutes*, art. 32.

⁴ Franklin, *La Vie Privée d'Autrefois*, p. 216.

⁵ Hazon, *Eloge Hist. de l'Université de Paris*, 1771.

⁶ *A History of the University of Oxford*, p. 97.

Poor scholars were wont to receive from the Chancellor a license to beg.¹ And Sir Thomas describes them, with bags and wallets, singing *Salve Regina* at rich men's doors. The poor students of Montaigu College went to the neighboring Chartreux Convent for their breakfast, awaiting their turn to be served with the other indigents. It is to be observed that not all college students were obliged to beg. There were two classes in every college, the rich, who paid for their maintenance, and the poor, who worked and begged for it. The meal of the junior students consisted of stale bread with half an ounce of butter, a plate of vegetables, half a herring, or an egg. The larger students, by reason of their age and prolonged labor, were allowed one-third of a pint of wine, a whole herring or two eggs, and a small piece of cheese or some fruit. They were never given meat.² The rigorous discipline and extreme abstinence practised in the College of Montaigu was proverbial, and intellect and appetite became equally keen with the name :

“Mons acutus, ingenium acutum, dentes acuti.”

Erasmus could not find words severe enough to stigmatize the inhuman treatment and unwholesome food that shattered his constitution and enfeebled him for life, while a student in this college.³ Rabelais had no kind words for the same institution and its sparrow-hawks. Ponocrates denounces the cruelties practised thus : “Criminals and condemned murderers are better treated.” And he ends in this emphatic manner : “If I were King of Paris, I would set fire to the place and burn up both principal and regents for permitting such inhumanity before their eyes.”⁴ Francion, in 1630, is no less severe as regards the fare doled out in the College of Lisieux. He considered the swineherds of his native town better nourished. “Withal,” he says, “we were called gourmands, and we should put our hand in the dish each after the other. Those who ate sparingly were the favorites.” Indeed, Francion’s whole description shows that he had fallen into the hands of a seventeenth century Squeers.⁵

But in order to be understood, mediæval manners and customs are to be looked at with other eyes than those of the nineteenth century. Francis of Assisi, in making poverty his bride, idealized that virtue.⁶ His disciples sanctified and exalted begging and caused men to respect poverty. There was no humiliation in

¹ *Munimenta Academica*, ii., p. 684.

² Félibien, *Histoire de Paris*, t. iii., p. 731.

³ *Dialogue, Flesh and Fish*.

⁴ *Gargantua*, liv. i., chap. xxvii., pp. 119, 120.

⁵ See A. F. Franklin, *La Vie Privée d'Autrefois ; Ecoles et Colleges*, pp. 223, 224.

⁶ *Paradiso*, xi., 64-100.

being poor; there was no personal degradation in asking an alms. Students no more lost their self-respect in begging for the house, or in doing menial service for their instructors, than did the page in waiting upon his master. This broad and elevated view of poverty established a brotherhood of feeling that inspired the better off to extend a helping hand to those less favorably circumstanced. The bursars of the college distributed their leavings to the poor scholars of their nation. Masters gave their pupils cast-off clothes and shoes.¹ This thoughtfulness extended to their holidays. In 1214, the commonalty of Oxford agreed to pay fifty-two shillings yearly for the use of poor scholars, and to give six hundred and fifty of them a meal of bread, ale, and pottage, with one large dish of flesh or fish on St. Nicholas' Day.² The poor students themselves resorted to many makeshifts that they might be enabled to pursue their studies. Sometimes they copied books and transcribed notes; sometimes they swept and garnished the rooms of a rich companion or an instructor to whom they attached themselves; sometimes they kept their lodging-house clean and orderly. Boys with good voices sang from door to door. This was the custom, even in Luther's day.³

The cost of instruction was in proportion to the pecuniary resources of each student. He who affirmed under oath that he had only sufficient to pay the expense of board and lodging was charged nothing for instruction. The education of youth ranked among the works of mercy, and indigent scholars were often thought of in men's last will and testament. Chests or funds were established for their temporary relief. Whoever borrowed money from the chest established by the Countess of Warwick, in 1293, was obliged to say the Paternoster thrice in honor of the Holy Trinity, and the Ave Maria five times in honor of the Blessed Virgin.⁴ It must be said of the University of Paris, along the line of its whole career, that there was a conspicuous lack of economy and forethought in money matters. Just as the bursars threw all surplusses into a common fund for the poor scholars, even so the excess of receipts over expenses was distributed among masters and bedels, and frequently drunk in the taverns.⁵ Of course, in these matters, as in all else, there were exceptions; there were students who thought only of dress and display, and there were masters who extorted money from their students.

The discipline, the exercises and pastimes of college life in its

¹ *De Disciplina Scholarium*, cap. iv.

² Anthony à Wood, i., p. 185.

³ Schmidt, *Jean Sturm*, p. 39.

⁴ *Munimenta Academica*, i., p. 63.

⁵ Bulæus, *Hist. Univ. Par.*, iv., 674; Thurot, *De l'Organization*, 27.

good and its bad aspects have been faithfully sketched by Rabelais in his terrible satire.¹ The colleges continued the traditions of the university schools in the observance of their holidays, games, amusements and customs. The newcomers into the college—*béjaunes*—were severely handled by the old pupils. They were terrorized into the performance of acts the most ridiculous or most dangerous, as suited the whims of their persecutors. Our modern hazing is a relic of these mediæval days. In Germany the custom of formal initiation was somewhat in the following manner: The freshman was seized, arrayed in a garment of coarse stuff, and upon his head was placed a cap with horns or ass's ears. His companions then chased him around, and, having caught him, they pretended to clip his ears with shears, shave him with an axe and stab him with augurs of wood, in order, as an ancient author puts it, that the new student may learn to suppress the horns of vanity, smooth away the rough corners of his nature, and clear the ways to his intellect. The paraphernalia was afterwards deposited in the centre of the hall, to indicate that the student had now cast from him all those evil habits which made him like unto the brute. His hair was then cut. An enormous ear-pick was pointed towards his temple, to indicate that he should listen only to wise and discreet discourses. A wild boar's tooth was extracted by means of long pincers; the operation was intended to show that the student should keep clear of calumny and slander. His hands and nails were cleansed, as an emblem that he was to avoid all quarrels. A black beard was painted on his face, as an image of his entering upon the years of manhood and a warning to him to throw aside the things of childhood. A chorus was sung over him as an emblem of the harmony in which he should live. He went on his knees before those assisting at the ceremony, as a token of respect for authority. The horns having been taken off and laid aside symbolized the fact that the student was changed and rose up a new man. He was then given the wine of gaiety and the salt of wisdom. Here ended the initiation, after which the student was received by his companions to the new life of study.² This mode of initiation was one of universal practice in the early days of university life; indeed, the tradition of it may be traced back to pagan times. St. Gregory Nazianzen speaks of a similar ceremony practised in Athens in his day, in order, as he tells us, to take the pride out of the young men and render them docile.³ Before me lies an old engraving representing the process of initia-

¹ *Gargantua*, liv. i., chaps. xvi-xxiv.

² A. G. Strobel, *Histoire du Gymnase Protestant de Strasbourg*. Appendix, No. 8, p. 133.

³ See Colin de Plancy, *Dictionnaire Feudales*, t. i., pp. 57, 58.

tion. The imprint is of 1666, but the scene was then at least three hundred years old. Spectators are seated apart. Two subjects are upon the floor awaiting the good pleasure of their torturers. Their horned caps are thrown one side. A would-be executioner stands over them with a battle-axe lifted up in the act of striking. Behind this man is a youth subjected to some other stage of the initiation; in the background others are represented as being led into the hall, each accompanied by his executioner holding a mace.¹ In all these rites and ceremonies masters united with students. They were one in study, one in play, one even in the disorders that arose from time to time.² In this manner may we catch a glimpse of mediæval college life far more instructive and suggestive than that revealed by charter and statute.

V.

Cardinal Newman sums up the relations of colleges to universities in the following words: "At first universities were almost democracies: colleges tended to break their anarchical spirit, introduced ranks and gave the example of laws, and trained up a set of students who, as being morally and intellectually superior to other members of the academical body, became the depositaries of academical power and influence."³ In proportion as the colleges became more perfect, the university began to decay. Some trace the decline as far back as 1380. Disintegration set in very rapidly after the Renaissance. The ecclesiastical character of the university diminished, and it grew more secular. In 1452 masters in medicine were dispensed from celibacy; in 1600 doctors in law attached to the university were permitted to marry. The Jesuits succeeded so admirably in perfecting the college system that at their door may safely be laid the chief cause of the decline of the university of Paris. By the end of the seventeenth century they had purchased twelve of its colleges. About 1764 twenty houses of the university were closed because they were not self-sustaining.⁴

Already in the seventeenth century murmurs began to arise concerning the decline and the inefficiency of the universities. In 1602 there appeared in England an appeal to Parliament to reform the universities of Oxford and Cambridge. A copy of this petition now lies before me. It is signed J. H., and in all probability is written by the Anglican bishop, Joseph Hall.⁵ The author is wholesale in his condemnation of university studies, uni-

¹ *Ritus Depositionis*. Argentineæ, apud Petrum Aubry, 1666.

² Thurot, *De l'Organisation de l'Université*, p. 39.

³ *Historical Sketches, Universities*, pp. 221, 222.

⁴ Thurot, p. 131.

⁵ 1574-1656.

versity methods and university results. "I could never yet," he tells us, "make so bad an idea of a true university, as that it should serve for no nobler end than to nurture a few raw striplings come out of some miserable country school, with a few shreds of Latin, that is as unmusical to a polite ear as the gruntings of a sow, or the noise of a saw can be to one who is acquainted with the laws of harmony. And then, possibly, before they have surveyed the Greek alphabet, to be racked and tortured with a sort of harsh, abstracted, logical notions, which their wits are no more able to endure than their bodies the strapado, and to be delivered over to a jejune, barren, peripatetic philosophy suited only (as Descartes says) to wits that are seated below mediocrity. . . . And then as soon as they have done licking of this file to be turned to graze in finer ethics, which perhaps tells them as much, in harder words, as they had heard their mothers talk by the fireside at home." This is the sum of knowledge that Hall finds in the universities of his day. Evidently the spirit of Bacon and Descartes is abroad.

What does he expect? What would he have? Here is his conception of what a university should be: "I have ever expected from an university, that though all men cannot learn all things, yet they should be able to teach all things to all men, and be able either to attract knowing men from abroad out of their own wealth or at least be able to make an exchange."² He finds the universities lacking in chemistry, in anatomy; there are no masters to make a thorough examination of old tenets or to review old experiments and traditions; none to make a survey of antiquities or solemn disquisition into history; there is an absence of all ready and generous teaching of the tongues. All these deficiencies he would have supplied—"not by some stripling youngster, who perhaps understands that which he professes as little as anything else, and mounts up into the chair twice or thrice a year to mutter over some few stolen impertinences, but by some staid man of tried and known abilities in his profession."³ He thinks the university schools "have not yet arrived to the exactness of the Jesuit colleges." Lord Bacon's estimate of the same colleges was no less favorable. "In all that regards the instruction of youth," he says, "we must consult the classes of the Jesuits, for there can be nothing better."⁴ Hall beseeches parliament to reduce "those friar-like lists of fellowships" into a fewer number, and those retained "to be bestowed upon men excellent in their particular endowments

¹ *An Humble Motion to the Parliament of England Concerning the Advancement of Learning and Reformation of the Universities.* By J. H. London: Printed for John Walker, at the Starre in Popes-Head Alley, MDCII., pp. 25, 26.

² *Ibid.*, p. 27.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 27, 28.

⁴ *De Augmentis Scientiarum*, lib. v., cap. iv.

and peculiar for some use or other, so that the number of the professors might increase."¹ He suggests the combining of all the colleges thinly scattered and poorly patronized up and down the land under one or other of the great universities; that there be greater freedom of the press and that two copies of every new book go to the public library; that all medals, statues and other antiquities at the time public property or confiscate to the crown go to the university museums; finally, that learned foreigners be duly honored and encouraged to make their homes in the universities.²

An anonymous writer of the same period, evidently intimate with the workings of the University of Paris and anxious for its welfare, sends out a similar cry of warning and bewails the evils he would see remedied. He is opposed to any infringement of the old order. He does not like to see the colleges monopolize university instruction. "There are," he tells us, "sixty-three colleges or high schools in the University of Paris. These were not originally established for boarders, nor in order that the arts may be taught in them, as is done to-day, but to feed and maintain certain scholars whom the ancients called Bursars. These attended public lectures in the rue du Fouarre."³ He would see them return to the old custom. The regents are no longer adequately compensated. He tells us that the Jesuits brought about this ruinous system of gratuitous instruction, "and even the Jesuits do not teach gratuitously since they secure such good endowments for their colleges."⁴ He would, therefore, gladly see them expelled from Paris, and hints at what he considers the proper mode of treatment for them, by calling attention to the fact that "Carlo Borromeo took from the Jesuits the seminaries that he had instituted in the diocese of Milan."⁵ He bewails the fact that neither among themselves have the masters the proper spirit, nor over their pupils have they the same influence as of old; and if they are to do good as formerly they must reform their present mode of living and in submission to the statute of September 20, 1577, go back to commons.

The anonymous author finds fault with the manner in which the scholars are treated in some of the colleges. He has no good word for the harsh discipline to which the students of Montaigu College are subjected. He advocates the reduction of their num-

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 29. I have modernized the spelling in these quotations.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 30, 31. (A copy of this rare tract is to be found in the library of Columbia College, New York).

³ *Memoires pour le Reglement de l'Université*, MDCX, in the *Bibliothèque Nationale*, under the heading "Paris Université" (Generalités), 1073, 24, 115-2130,

p. 2.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

ber to a third of what it then was, so that they be better fed and better clothed—and that they wear “a dress more civilized and respectable than that they now wear.” He bewails the neglect of lessons upon the holidays and feast-days. He says: “Twenty-five or thirty years ago lessons were taught in the university on feast-days and on Sundays, from nine to ten in the morning,” and from four to five in the afternoon, and on the feasts of the Apostles there were public declamations—*usance qu’il est necessaire remettre*.¹ The regents he finds derelict in duty: “Each regent should watch in turn over the scholars at play, in order to see that they behave with modesty and reserve, that they speak only the Latin tongue, and that they salute politely all who pass through the ground. He is dissatisfied with the preparatory schools of the university. They are not doing their duty, they are not grounding the children sufficiently. He tells us that there are thirty such schools in Paris, that the masters of them are frequently ignorant, and that they persist in carrying the children into other fields of study rather than confining themselves to the rudiments. In consequence, he complains bitterly of the difficulty of unlearning children what they had been badly taught, and above all of correcting habits of erroneous pronunciation.”² Such a foundation can support only a poor superstructure. And what solidity can be found in institutions the principals of which are elected, not through merit, but as the result of canvassing and intrigue?³ Such was the state of affairs among the colleges of the University of Paris in 1610. Here we part company with the anonymous author, grateful for the glimpse he gave us into the causes that led to the disintegration of that wonderful structure.

The University of Paris had begun to decline in power and influence long before. In the beginning of the sixteenth century while there was slight diminution in the number of her students, a marked change was passing over her spirit. Her prestige was on the wane. She had ceased to be the seminary of Christendom and was simply a national institution.⁴ The causes of this decline were both local and general. In the fourteenth century universities were multiplied in nearly every country in Europe. Each nation—sometimes each province or district—possessing its own university, naturally students stayed at home and with few exceptions availed themselves of the universities established at their doors. The old-time severity exercised in the distribution of academical honors became relaxed and forthwith the degrees from Paris lost their primitive significance and were in consequence less eagerly sought. Finally, during the sojourn of the popes in Avig-

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 21.² *Ibid.*, p. 22.³ *Ibid.*, p. 23.⁴ Thurot, p. 2.

non, ecclesiastical dignities were showered upon the professors, who thereupon threw up their positions and their studies, and in consequence the work of the university was generally done by inferior men.¹ Then as now is it true that personal worth and personal influence are the chief factors in determining the character and prestige of college or university. Now, as then, a great educator, or a great body of educators, can establish themselves in a barn and attract crowds, while the noblest architectural structures, with the most improved modern school-furniture, may proudly raise their spires, and yet, if directed by incompetency or mediocrity, will be passed by, or will be patronized by that class of parents which judges the merits of a school by the picture upon its prospectus.

BROTHER AZARIAS.

¹ The first Rotulus Nominandorum was sent in 1316 to John XXII. See Professor Shirley's introduction to *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, p. 11.

HOW WORDS CHANGE THEIR MEANING—AN
INSTANCE.

THE Catholic Church, unlike the sects which environ her, is in intimate contact with every subject of human thought. Theology, as the queen of the sciences, embraces all knowledge. Astronomy is hers which deals with those vast bodies before the contemplation of which the imagination reels, and stretches of time that may indeed be represented by figures, but whose immensity no human mind can grasp. She is no less at home in animal life. The ox, the ass, the wolf, the sheep, and the goat are used in her symbolic teaching. The ant is with her a type of provident industry; the bee, for eighteen hundred years, has supplied the wax for her altars, and has been a lesson to her children of orderly hierarchical government.

New sciences are springing up all around, and as they come into being they, one by one, fall into their allotted place in her divine plan of Christian thought. It is only in very recent days that the study of words has become scientific. To our grandfathers and those who lived before them, it was something very little, if at all better, than guess-work. They would have laughed at any one who should have told them that in the talk of the fireside, that was daily on their lips, there was, for those who knew how to conduct the search, a whole fund of history,—history stretching far beyond the reach of written records, which at points far too numerous to indicate here, came in contact with the Catholic Church, her sublime teachings and awe-inspiring ceremonial. We will illustrate what we mean by taking one example,—the word *Hearse*. It is no fitter for our purpose than scores or even hundreds of others which we might have chosen, but its curious history and strange fluctuations of meaning may perhaps have more interest for our readers than many another whose progress up to the present hour has been no less instructive.

Modern people, who have not devoted themselves to philological studies, know of but one meaning for the word *hearse*. They picture to themselves, when they hear it pronounced, a funeral car, with its trappings of woe and its nodding plumes. If they have visited the Netherlands or North Germany they may perhaps add to their mental sketch the white death's-heads and cross bones painted on the panels, and the driver in his long black cloak with a deep, wide,

quilted frill round his neck, such as we see represented in pictures of the time of King James I. This is, as far as we have been able to ascertain, the only sense in which the word *hearse* is now used by those who speak English.

Hearse may, like most of the other words which we use in every-day talk, be traced back to an Aryan root. We shall not, however, ask our readers to travel with us so very far backward up the stream of time. The most remote ancestor that we shall claim for our word is *Hirpex*, the Latin term for a rake or harrow. This word *Hirpex*, though not identical, was evidently near of kin to *Ericius* or *Hericius*, a hedge-hog, a term which was employed in a figurative sense by writers on the art of war to signify a military engine of the nature of a portcullis. In Cæsar's "Commentaries" we have "*Erat objectus portis ericius*,"¹ and Sallust says, "*Eminebant in modum ericii militaris veruta binum pedum*,"²

We have no clear notion of what was the exact form of the Roman *Hirpex*, but there is nothing in which mankind have been more conservative than in the form of their agricultural implements. We shall therefore probably not stray far from the truth if we assume that the harrows, of which we have a few representations in mediæval illuminations, faithfully represent the *Hirpex* of the days of the Cæsars. We are not aware that any of these illuminations have been reproduced by engraving or photography, but here the science of blazonry comes to our aid. An old English family, of the surname of Harrow, had for its arms three harrows, joined together by what the heraldic writers call a wreath, but which is, in truth, the iron ring or strong piece of rope by which it was the custom to fasten them together in triplets. An engraving of this shield is given in John Guillim's "Display of Heraldry."³ They are represented as triangular implements, having three bars running across, in which the tynes or teeth are fixed.

The word *hearse* was occasionally, but very rarely, used to indicate the agricultural harrow. Lord Berners, in his translation of Froissart's "Chronicles," published in 1523, says of a certain battle that "The archers . . . strode in manner of a herse, and the men of armes in the botome of the batayle."⁴ The first ecclesiastical use of the word is probably due to France, but we had it in early times in England. It signifies a triangular frame of wood, which was suspended by a cord from the roof of the church. It would seem to have been in form just like a harrow, but at the points where the bars crossed each other there were sockets in which to

¹ Lib. iii., c. 67.

² *Fragm.*, lib. iii.

³ 5th ed., 1679, p. 214.

⁴ Vol. i., ch. cxxx., p. 156.

insert candles. These hearses soon gave way, except perhaps in very poor churches, to chandeliers of metal; but the hearse only changed its position. It was taken down from above-head and mounted on a stand or post, and used in the service of *Tenebrae*. In this case it usually contained twenty-four lights, but the custom was not always the same. Sometimes it was made to contain fourteen yellow candles, with one of white wax in the centre. The yellow candles symbolized the eleven faithful Apostles and the three Marys, the white candle in the middle representing our blessed Lord. In the *Tenebrae* services of Catholic England, fourteen psalms were said. As each one was ended a candle was put out. When the time arrived that the white taper alone remained alight, it was concealed behind or near to the altar so as to leave the church in total darkness.

When the people had got accustomed to connect the word hearse with a frame for holding candles, it was but a very short step to take to arrive at the next meaning. When England was Catholic, it never occurred to any one that, except in the case of notorious evil livers who had died impenitent, a funeral could take place without prayers being said for the departed soul. In all cases the body was carried into the church and placed near or at least in sight of the altar. Over the body a light frame of wood-work was placed by which the pall was supported. These frames were a regular part of the church's furniture; at the corners, and sometimes on the ridge also, there were holes for candles. To these frames the term hearse soon became applied. Of these wooden hearses, not a single example is known to have come down to our time. Such a thing indeed could hardly be expected. Their fragile nature would render them peculiarly liable to destruction, and they had become mere lumber when, as far as the state could do it, prayers for the departed had been abolished. Occasionally these wooden hearses were copied in metal and made permanent parts of the tombs of persons whose last resting-place was within the church. A few examples of hearses of this kind have survived the storms of upwards of three hundred years. A very graceful iron hearse of this kind still canopies the alabaster tomb of one of the Marmons in the church of Tanfield, near Ripon, Yorkshire. It has attached to it sconces for holding seven candles, two on each side and three on the ridge. A portion of another, of singularly beautiful design, is preserved in the museum at South Kensington. The effigy of Richard, Earl of Warwick, who died in 1439, possesses a hearse of this kind. It is smaller than those we have already mentioned, but is made of brass, or rather of that mixed metal which our ancestors called *latten*. The contract for making it still exists,

and it is noteworthy that it is therein spoken of as a hearse,¹ showing that before the middle of the fifteenth century hearse had become the recognized term for these objects.

The next departure was to apply the word hearse to a temporary canopy of timber decorated with a profusion of tapers and draped with hangings and religious and heraldic banners, which was placed over the body during the funeral rites. It has been known in every country in western Europe, but England is, we believe, the only country which has called it a hearse. *Chapelle ardente* is the ordinary French term. We find *castrum doloris* in Latin, and *catafalco* in Italian.² When bodies had to be carried a long distance, it was the custom to erect a hearse of this kind in every church wherein it rested for the night. Minute accounts of several of these hearses have come down to our time, showing that in many cases they were very sumptuously decorated. They were, we may be sure, never in common use. Their costliness must have confined them to persons of the higher ranks, or people otherwise of great distinction. Chaucer knew these hearses well; as he spent much of his life in court society, he must have seen them. In his *Dream* he has given a very beautiful description of the prayers which were offered up around them :

“ And after that about the herses,
Many orisons and verses,
Without note full softly
Said were, and that full heartily,
That all the night, till it was day,
The people in the church can pray,
Unto the Holy Trinity,
Of those soules to have pity.”³

Though the persons who accepted what goes by the name of the Reformation were all but unanimous in rejecting the doctrine of prayers for the dead, yet with that remarkable inconsistency which is a distinguishing characteristic of so many of their actions, they retained the use of these sumptuous hearses. They seem, in post-reformation times, to have been used principally as a mark of social rank, and as a means of heraldic display. In 1589, a violent Puritan satire against the then existing order of things in church and state was issued at some secret press, bearing the strange title of “Pappe with a Hatchet,” wherein the following passage occurs :

“ Now you put me in minde of the matter, there is a booke coming out of a hundred merrie tales, and the petigree of Martin, fetchte from the burning of Sodome, his armes shall be set on his hearse, for we are providing for his funerall.”⁴

¹ Parker, *Glossary of Architecture*, 1850, vol. i., p. 250.

² Rock, *Church of Our Fathers*, vol., ii., p. 496.

³ Ed., 1866, p. 402.

⁴ Ed., 1844, p. 17.

In William Habington's *Castara* we find the lines :

" Lily, Rose and Violet,
Shall the perfumed Hearse beset,"

which is the only evidence that occurs to us of those hearses being decorated with flowers. That stationary hearses were in use at the funerals of the gentry as late as 1681, is proved by a sermon preached that year by a minister of the Established Church at the burial of Sir Alan Broderick. He told his hearers that the dead knight had made express provision in his will " that his herse should by no means be garnished with the usual ornaments of a family, and no escutcheon should either there or elsewhere appear."¹

The funeral car, or chariot, originally differed but little from these stationary hearses, except that it was upon wheels, and the necessities of the case required it to be smaller. We are not aware that these wheeled hearses were in use in Catholic times ; however, they may have been, but it is probable that the bodies of all but the very great, if they had to travel far, would be conveyed in an ordinary wagon. The body of Colonel Rainborowe, who was foully murdered by royalist desperadoes from Pontefract Castle, on 29th October, 1648, seems to have been conveyed from that town to his burial place at Wapping, near London, in a hearse, and Milton, in his " Epitaph on the Marchioness of Winchester," when he introduces the word implies that it was a movable structure :

" Gentle lady, may thy grave
Peace and quiet ever have ;
After this thy travel sore
Sweet rest seize thee evermore.

* * * * *

Here be tears of perfect moan
Wept for thee in Helicon,
And some flowers and some bays
For thy herse to strew the ways,"

Anthony Walker, a Protestant minister, preaching, in 1673, said that " more friends attend an hearse to the Towne-end than will drive through with it the whole journey " ;² and in 1690 they had become one of the necessities of civilization, for we find in that year an advertisement in the *London Gazette* offering them for hire.

We have accomplished our task, having furnished our readers with a sketch of the evolution of the word through the changes of the Middle Ages until its meaning had been settled as we know

¹ P. 18.

² *Lees Lacrymans*, p. 10.

it to-day. We must not conclude, however, without pointing to what we consider as a disease of language, not in any true sense a development. We mean the bad habit with more than one writer of the seventeenth century of using *hearse* in the sense of a dead body. We have before us an extract from Thomas Heywood's "*Brytaines Troy*," exemplifying what we mean, and other similar blunders might easily be found, but no good end can be served by reproducing them here or elsewhere.

EDWARD PEACOCK, F.S.A.

Scientific Chronicle.

CIPHER.—“U O a O & I O U.”—(.).

WE have a vague recollection reaching back with uncertain gropings into the dimness of the distant past that the author of the above quotation was Dean Swift, but unfortunately we have not been able to lay our hand on the evidence. So we let it pass for the present, and jog on with our “Cipher.”

The great modern Dictionaries open up to us whole mines of information anent the wanderings of this word, through various languages, since it was first set adrift on the stream of time, down to our own days. In these days of tall erudition, no word seems to have the ring of true coin unless its origin can be traced back to the Sanskrit.

Now, the learned in philological matters tell us that “Cipher” was written, in that somewhat ancient language, “*Sunya*,” meaning “empty.” Being thus a mere adjective, and poorly filled out at that, but yet, with prophetic eye, foreseeing doubtless all the buffetings it would have to endure in its long journey, it early applied for admission into the ranks of the “substantives,” and had its claim allowed.

Poor “*Sunya*”; it has been battered and bruised a good deal in its voyage adown the ages; it has been beaten and broken, and rolled like a pebble in the torrent, till its sharp edges and angles have all been worn off, and it has become as round and smooth as an O. In the hands of the Arabs it grew thin, taking the form “*Sifr*” or “*Sefr*” (adjective and substantive) with the signification of “empty” or “nothing.” Let us see now how it has fared among other peoples. Here is a partial list of its forms:

Danish,	Siffer.	Dutch,	Cijfer.
Old Swedish,	Siffra.	English :	
Old French,	Cifre.	Fourteenth Century—	Sipher, Si-
Old Spanish,	Cifra.		phre.
Portuguese,	Cifra.	Sixteenth Century—	Cyfer, Cy-
Italian,	Cifera and Cifra.		fre, Cifer, Cifre, Cifra, Ciphre,
Modern Spanish,	Chiffer.		Ciphra, Sypher, Syphre, Zi-
Modern French,	Chiffre.		phre.
		Eighteenth Century—	Cypher.
		Nineteenth—	Cipher.

We have noticed at times that some of our contemporaries have not even yet caught up with the nineteenth century spelling.

The sonorous and stately old Romans could never have admitted such

a barbaric word as "sifr," but they caught the sound, and it reminded them of their darling west wind, *zephyrus*, the zephyr, and so the poor little waif grew fat again, under the pompous name, "*zephyrum*." Not content with this the Romans superadded a new meaning, making the word signify, besides its original "nothing," "a secret," or "an occult thing."

After that we have :

Modern Latin,	Zifera—æ.
German,	Zifer, Ziffer (a number, a sign).
Italian,	Zifero, Zifro, Zefro, Zero.
French,	Zéro.
Spanish,	Zero.
Portuguese,	Zero.
English,	Zero.

From "Sunya" then we get, through the lapse of unknown ages, to "cipher" on the one hand, and to "zero" on the other. Truly, it looks, after all, like a much ado about "nothing."

But though "cipher" and "zero" are fairly cousins, they agree only in one thing, and that is in "nothing." Whatever greatness the Romans may have wished to confer on their "*zephyrum*," its modern descendant, "zero," means "nothing," and nothing else. "Cipher," on the other hand, has usurped whatever the Romans intended for "*zephyrum*," for, besides clothing itself with many new meanings, it has, under one at least of those meanings, actually had the audacity to have itself elected to an honorary seat among the very *verbs* themselves.

The word Cipher has finally come to signify :

1. (In Arithmetic and Algebra) "nothing," "naught," "zero," of which the symbol is 0.
2. (Figuratively.) Something of no value.
3. A written character in general, but more especially a numeral character. In this sense the word is now rarely used, but from it we have the verb "*to cipher*," which, though avoided by certain ultra-purists, is as classical as any word in the language.
4. A monogram ; also a Coat of Arms, especially of women. (?)
5. (a) A secret method of writing.
(b) The thing so written.
(c) The key to decipher the writing.

Having finished this rather long but we hope not entirely useless pre-amble, we arrive at the real subject of this article, which is : "Cipher," according to the definitions just given under No. 5 above.

There never was a time when men did not need to keep secret from some what they wished to reveal to others. This has been the case especially with kings, queens, statesmen, ambassadors, army and navy officers, and others in high stations. The result is easily attained when the persons concerned can meet face to face, and communicate their thoughts by word of mouth. But when this cannot be done, it becomes

much more difficult. Recourse must then be had to writing, but it is evident that, when anything very serious is at stake, ordinary writing, which may readily fall into the hands of a third party, would not do. In that case it is necessary to have recourse to secret or cipher-writing. It is of a few of the kinds of cipher-writing which have been tried that the present article proposes to give a brief description.

The art of secret writing has been called Cryptography, from κρυπτος (hidden), and γραφειν (to write); also Steganography, from στεγανος (covered) and γραφειν, and by many other names, but the word "Cipher-writing" may be used to embrace them all.

One of the early methods was that in use among the Lacedemonians. When a general was sent out to do a little fighting for his country, he was supplied with a round stick or staff which he preserved carefully, while the state authorities kept an exactly similar one at home. When these latter wished to send any secret communication to their general, they wound a narrow strip of parchment spirally around the stick, from end to end, making the edges meet close together. Then they wrote along that line of junction of the edges, in such a way that the upper half of each letter was on one side of that line, and the lower half on the other. When unwound the writing consisted of broken letters, and in this state the strip of parchment was sent. On receiving it, the general wound it around *his* stick, and as it would fit only one way, he easily made the broken letters match again, and so read the despatch. This was certainly a crude method, and if, in other matters, the old Spartans had not done better, history would never have taken the trouble to record their exploits; for there would have been none worth recording.

The deciphering of a message written in that way, would be merely child's play. In the first place, there would not be the slightest difficulty in the world in rolling that strip of parchment so as to make the parts of the letters match, and that without the aid of the stick at all. We have tried it many times without once failing. In the next place, however it may have been with the abominable scrawls that stood for letters in those times and places, *we* certainly now, with either our Roman or Italic letters, would find little difficulty in reading from the upper half only, of a line of print or even of decent manuscript.

The Romans, too, had their methods, one of which was odd enough to deserve a passing glance just here. They shaved the head of a slave, and on the surface so prepared they wrote the message with a quasi-indelible ink. After the hair had grown again the slave was sent on his errand, when a second shaving revealed the message. For slowness this would be hard to beat, and yet it was beaten once to our knowledge. We are waiting yet for a letter that was addressed to us thirty-one years ago. If there were any secrets in it, they are doubly secret now, for the one who wrote is gone forever.

The historian, Polybius (204-122 B.C.), states that a still more ancient writer, Æneas Tactitus, had collected and described at least twenty different methods of secret writing, some of which he had invented him-

self. We have been unable to verify this statement, as the writings of the late Mr. Tactitus seem to be out of print. From that time onward cipher-writing has always been in use; but there is a very long gap in the literature of the subject. Treatises on the subject may have been written; it is hard to believe that there were none; if so, they must have been lost, and it is not until A.D. 1500 that we find any serious works thereon.

In that year the Abbot Trithemius, of Spanheim, published at the instance of the Duke of Bavaria his "Polygraphia" (many kinds of writing), of which six books were devoted to "Cryptographia," as well as a larger work entitled "Steganographia," substantially on the same subject. These works have served as the foundation on which nearly all subsequent works have been based.

The works of the good abbot were looked upon with suspicion on account of the many technical terms he used, so much so that one Berville caused them to be publicly given to the flames. Copies of them were however preserved, and later on men arose who had brains enough to understand them. The best and bravest of these, at a time when bravery was needed to defend the abbot and his works, were Blaise de Vigenere (Paris, 1587), and the Duke of Lunenburg (1624). They proved clearly, and, what is more to the purpose, they convinced their contemporaries that cryptography contained no magic, witchcraft, black art nor other diabolical mystery, but that it was a perfectly innocent and a very useful art.

Before either of these two, as early indeed as 1563, John Baptist Porta, the well-known mathematician of Naples, published a work of five volumes on secret writing (*De furtivis literarum notis*), but as he was far away from the scene of the abbot's trouble, he seems to have gone on his own way without bothering his head about the witchcraft question.

The much-extolled Francis Bacon (A.D. 1600) invented and used a number of ciphers, some of them very intricate. He gave a great deal of thought to the subject, and has left a good deal in his writings of very great interest. Among other things he lays down as conditions of good ciphers the following:

"The virtues required in them are three: that they be easy and not laborious to write and read; that they be safe and impossible to be deciphered; and that they be, if possible, without suspicion."

This is an ideal to which no cipher yet invented has perfectly attained; not even the ones invented by Bacon himself. We shall see some specimens further on.

John Wilkins, Bishop of Chester, in 1641; good old Father Kircher, of magic lantern renown, in 1663; Caspar Scott (or Gaspar Schott, S. J., if you prefer that spelling), the balloon man, in 1665, and hosts of others published treatises on cryptography for the use of kings, queens, ambassadors, diplomatists, and gentlemen generally.

Others gave special attention to the art of deciphering secret writings. Among the best-known of these were John Falconer, in 1685; John

Wallis, mathematician of Oxford, in 1689; John Davys, in 1737; Philip Thicknesse, in 1772; Professor Wheatstone, in 1858. The last-named succeeded in deciphering important documents from the pen of Charles I., which had resisted all attempts in that direction for more than two hundred years.

The best modern work on the subject is probably the "Kryptographik" of J. L. Klüber (Tübingen, 1809), in which the different methods of secret writing are carefully classified. It is in German, and by that sign you may know it is thorough.

We do not intend to re-edit all, nor indeed any of the above-mentioned works, at least, just now; but we would fain give a few specimens of some of the ciphers which have been invented up to date, so that those of our readers who have a need or a liking for such things, may be able to choose wisely and well.

1. Many of our common puzzles, made up of letters, parts of words, and pictures, partake more or less of the nature of cryptographic writing, but they are useless for any serious purpose, because they have no key, and it would be just as hard for the one to whom they might be sent to make out their meaning as it would be for any one else. Of this class we have, on the borderland between sense and nonsense, inclining strongly to the latter, such well-known examples as: IOU (I owe you); IXL (I excel); OIC (oh, I see); URMT (you are empty), etc. Also the quotation at the head of this article: "UOaO&IOU" ("you sigh for a cipher and I sigh for you"). The *rebus*, consisting of a series of pictures (sometimes eked out with a few letters), which suggest certain sounds, while the sounds in turn suggest letters or words, is of this class. Thus, venerable for its antiquity, comes up:



which, being interpreted, intends to say: "I saw a man drink a barrel of beer." There is only one thing missing from this cryptograph, and that is *the man*. Well, being of a retiring disposition, and feeling, perhaps, a little exhausted by his extraordinary exploit, he just lay down behind the barrel to think and rest. This is *hidden* writing, with a vengeance.

Picture-writing has always been in use among those who could draw, but who could not write because they could not spell, and thereby hangs a tale, which, in this connection, may be worth retailing. A certain man (cut West) kept a store, and, as is usual in the village-stage of civilization, dealt in everything possible and impossible. He knew the use and value of the digits, 1, 2, 3, etc., but he could not spell, so he kept his accounts cryptographically. One of the items in his account with a farmer named Smith was this:

8 . . 2 . . 9 O,

which meant that he had sold to Mr. Smith (whom he designated as No. 8 among his customers), on February 9th, a cheese. Smith refused payment, and was sued. Having proved to the satisfaction of the court, by the testimony of his family and neighbors, that, instead of buying cheeses, he had manufactured and sold large numbers of them, he was acquitted. The storekeeper paid the costs. The majesty of the law having been satisfied, the farmer took the merchant aside and said:

"Jim, if you hadn't been so 'tarnal fast, I'd 'av' paid you."

"There," says Jim, "I knowed I sold you that cheese."

"No, you didn't neither; but I do remember you sold me a small *grindstone*."

"Gosh! I forgot to put the hole into it. Come and liquor up, but don't tell the boys."

Of course, the secret writing consisting of pictures interspersed with puns, and often very poor ones, is away down below the dignity of our high-toned civilization; yet it is not to be too lightly despised. In some of its aspects it bears a close relationship to that secret or sacred writing to which the Egyptians confided the history of kings and kingdoms, and which baffled the skill of interpreters, or would-be interpreters, for centuries upon centuries.

2. One of the many methods of writing used in Egypt of old was by means of pictures of familiar objects, each picture representing either a word, a syllable or a letter, as if we should make the picture of a lion stand for the letter "l," a bear for "b," a cat for "c," a tree for "t," and so on. Our modern nursery rhymes have a suspicion of this in them, as:

"A was an Archer that shot at a frog;
B was a Butcher that kept a great dog;
C was a Countess all covered with lace;
D was a Drunkard that had a red face."

The deciphering of the Egyptian hieroglyphics has opened to the world the history of one of the most wonderful peoples that have ever existed.

3. A trick, intended to convey messages secretly, and often used by prisoners, is to spell each word backwards, as:

"Emoc ta enin kcolco worromot thgin. Ruo gnag lliw eb ydaer, dna neh woy kcatta no eht tsae edis ew lliw teg tuo yb eht tsew."

Of course it never succeeds, but they keep on trying it, all the same.

4. Another dodge is to agree with a correspondent on a certain page of a given book, of which each has a copy. Thus, Brown wants to send the following message to Jones:

"The traitor will be with me at the cross-roads at ten o'clock. You know the rest."

To put this in cipher, Brown turns to the book and page, and finds that the 12th letter on that page is *t*; so he sets down the number 12. The 33d is *h*, the 5th is *e*, the 50th is *t*, the 29th is *r*, the 26th is *a*, the 17th is *i*, the 69th is *t*, the 2d is *o*, the 58th is *r*.

He therefore gets for the first two words the numbers: 12, 33, 5, 50,

29, 26, 17, 69, 2, 58. Continuing on in the same way, he sets down a number for each letter of the message, and sends the list of numbers so made out. On receiving it, Jones has only to turn to the proper page of the book and hunt up the letter corresponding to each number. Should a needed letter not be found on the page, then the letter itself may be inserted in the cipher; for an odd letter here and there would not render the message intelligible to a person not in the secret.

This cipher seems at first sight to be endowed with two of Bacon's three "virtues," and yet it has its weak points. For a few communications it might answer, but in the case of an extended correspondence we think it would be liable to fail; for if the same page were used all the time, it would finally become worn, and as this cipher is not "without suspicion," the worn page would lead to discovery. If, on the contrary, a new page were frequently agreed on, this would lead to confusion, unless a dated record were kept of the changes, and this, falling into the hands of a detective, would again reveal everything.

5. One of the methods intended to give a cipher "without suspicion" is shown by the following example, taken from a book printed in Dublin in 1791:

"I shall be much obliged to you, as reading alone engages my attention at present, if you will lend me any of the eight volumes of the 'Spectator.' I hope you will excuse this freedom, but for a winter's evening I don't know a better entertainment. If I fail to return it soon, never trust me for the time to come."

This looks very innocent, but it is not what the fellow wanted to say at all. His friend was supplied with a piece of cardboard of the width of the written page and long enough vertically to cover the message. It had portions cut out, so that when placed over the writing, the only words left exposed were:

"I shall be . . . alone . . . at . . . eight . . . this . . . evening . . . don't . . . fail . . . to come."

This cipher is very easy to read when you have the key-card properly slotted, but it is terribly hard to write. The writer has, of course, a key-card identical with that of the receiver. This he applies to the unwritten page, and through the open spaces he writes his message. He then removes the card and fills in the vacant spaces in such a way as to make sense and "unsuspicious" English. This is extremely difficult, and, besides, those cards would, sooner or later, fall into the hands of an outsider, and then the cipher is deciphered. Moreover, this cipher contains a great deal of chaff for its wheat. In the foregoing example, framed by an expert, there are sixty-one words, of which forty-nine are mere padding, while only twelve form the real message. Kings and queens are welcome to any comfort they may find in this system.

6. There is a well-known method of writing in such a way that it looks all right when read straight ahead; but when alternate lines are omitted, the sense is changed to what the writer really wants to say. The following, written by a soldier in a military prison during the late war, is a specimen:

"They are treating us very kindly here,
and you would be surely pleased
if you think it kindness to be treated
like men, who can appreciate, and not
like grovelling slaves. It is, indeed,
as good as we could expect, and not
as bad as you thought, or even worse,
as some have not been ashamed to say."

Prisoners' letters are never without suspicion, and he would be a dull officer indeed who would not immediately see that the real meaning of the message is contained in the 1st, 3d, 5th and 7th lines only.

7. There are four methods which, as they do not differ in principle, we class under one head. They consist:

(*a*) In representing each letter of the alphabet by another letter taken regularly so many places ahead, as *d* for *a* (the fourth letter for the first), *e* for *b*, etc.; or in working in reverse order, as in taking *c* for *h* (the third letter for the eighth), *a* for *i*, etc. This was the method employed by Julius Cæsar in his despatches from the seat of war.

(*b*) In taking as cipher a letter as far from the end of the alphabet as the true letter is from the beginning, as *z* for *a*, *s* (the eighth from the end) for *h* (the eighth from the beginning), etc. The Jewish Rabbis made use of this method, and examples of it are said to be found even in the Sacred Scriptures.

(*c*) In using for each letter any arbitrary sign, such as punctuation marks, short-hand letters, numerals, or what not, or any admixture of these. Cardinal Wolsey, the Earl of Stafford, and others in their time were deep in this system.

(*d*) In writing the letters of the alphabet in any confused order whatever, and then taking the first of that list for *a*, the second for *b*, and so on. This cipher has been perhaps the most commonly employed by the majority of cipher-writers for centuries.

To write by the first and second methods (*a* and *b*) requires no key, but by the process of deciphering described below they may easily be translated. The third and fourth (*c* and *d*) require a key, but even they will not stand against a regular course of systematic guessing.

An example of the third class (*c*) is given and deciphered in Poe's story of "The Gold Bug"; his method of deciphering, however, might, we think, be somewhat improved on.

In olden times ciphers were sometimes written in which spaces were left between the words, but this is almost surely fatal, because you then have the number of letters in each word. Now, in English the only words of one letter are *a*, *I* and *O*, and this gives a clue to a part of the key. In like manner, the most ordinary words of two letters are *be*, *at*, *to* . . . ; and with a little guessing it is not hard to find which fits the best. No one now-a-days in writing a cipher, in dead earnest, would risk it in that way; the letters should be strung along without any breaks.

As an example now in deciphering a cipher of the fourth class (*d*), let us take the following:

m p l j l y l q l j f n b n m s i l f p l y i l y z r d x v n u u r j v m r
 m l x x m p l s j b l z j l m b m r m p l s j l y l i s l b n y v s m b l x v
 r i p n c c l y b m p n m m p l k z n y b n u l x k m l x x m p l i n x x
 l q l y m r m p l s j u j s l y v b p l y z l u j r i m p l h l o s y y s y o i
 l y p n q l l y v l n q r j l v m r u s y v b r i l i l n y b r u i n a s y o m p
 l s j b l z j l m b a y r f y m r n u n q r j l v u l f f p s x l p s v s y o m
 p l i u j r i n x x r m p l j b.

In this we have 251 letters, and as in ordinary English there are, on an average, from four to six letters in a word, we have here probably from 50 to 60 words; this fact may be of some use later on.

Now, patient reader (and no others need apply), please lend a hand, and help us decipher this awful-looking epistle.

The first thing to be done is, of course, to find out how often each symbol has been used. Here is the result in the regularly decreasing order of number of times:

		Times.					
The cipher-letter l occurs		44
“ m “		23
“ y “		21
“ p “		17
“ r “		16
“ n “		16
“ j “		15
“ s “		15
“ b “		13
“ i “		12
“ x “		12
“ u “		10
“ v “		10
“ f “		5
“ q “		5
“ z “		5
“ o “		4
“ a “		:	2
“ c “		2
“ k “		2
“ h “		1
“ d “		1

Now, in a composition of reasonable length certain letters will recur frequently, others less frequently, others, again, very seldom. There will be some variation in the frequency of recurrence, according to the subject-matter, and also according to the style of the writer, if he have any; yet there will be less variation than one might at first suppose.

Poe, in “The Gold Bug,” gives, as the order of most frequent recurrence, the following:

e a o i d h n r s t u y c f g l m w b k p q x z (j and v forgotten?).

Bailey's list is :

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
et.	aoni.	rsh.	dl.	cwum.	fygpb.	vk.	xqjz.

A list made out from a page of the QUARTERLY runs thus :

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
et.	anio.	srh.	ld.	ucm.	fpgywb.	vk.	xqjz.

Bailey divides his list into eight groups, as seen above, and says that though the order of frequency may vary somewhat, still a letter will rarely stray far from its own group. This statement is corroborated by the fact that our list, made from such good English as is furnished by writers in the QUARTERLY, is practically identical with his. The only letter which has changed its group is the *w*, having passed from the fifth to the sixth. But Poe is very far astray for several letters, especially in the case of the important letter *t*, which he places in the tenth place, whereas, even in the key which results from his own cipher, it turns out to be, just as in Bailey's and in our own, in the second place.

Let us now see what we can do with our cipher. The first column of the "Table," pages 868-869, is Bailey's list, as given above. The second column gives the different symbols of our cipher. The third gives the number of times each cipher-letter recurs. The horizontal lines marked (1) contain the total cipher. The remaining lines (2), (3), (4) . . . show the gradual working out of the interpretation as explained in the subsequent notes.

THE DECIPHERING OF A CIPHER.

[illegible]

Notes on the Deciphering of mply

Taking Bailey's probabilities as a guide, we replace the cipher-letter *l* by *e*, and *m* by *t*. This gives us the lines as at (2); and, after inspection, we see no special reason why it should, or should not, be correct.

The next cipher is *y* (occurring 21 times); it is probably a blind for *a*, *o*, *n*, or *i*. By inspection and counting, we find that by using *a* for *y*, we would get the combination *ea* 9 times (including *ea* once) out of about 60 words. Now whether *ea* be looked upon as a diphthong, or whether the *e* be taken as the final letter of one word and the *a* as the initial of the next in each case, this *ea* seems to recur rather too frequently. To translate *y* by *o* or *i* would be still worse. We rarely, if ever, crowd our vowels together after that fashion. Let us try something more probable. The next letter in group 2¹ is *n*. Substituting *n* for *y* all along, we get the reading as in line (3); it may or may not be correct, but we see no objection to it so far, and we are free to change it later on if necessary.

The next cipher-letter is *p*. (used 17 times), and the unused letters of group 2 are *a*, *o*, *i*. If we translate *p* by *a*, and then run our eye along the lines (3) and count, we find that we would get the combination *ae* 11 times (9 times in *tue* and twice in *aen*). This does not look promising; neither does *toe* nor *tie*, 9 times, look healthy. We shall therefore leave *a*, *o*, *i*, provisionally, and pass on to group of *r*, *s*, *h*. This would give us either *tre*, *tse*, or *the*, 9 times. But *tse*, though possible, is hardly likely to occur so often; *tre* is frequent in English, but, at the very beginning of the line, it is followed by so many *e*'s (*tre ene e*) that it does not seem to point to a rational result. Pass it and try *h*, by which we get *the*, than which nothing is more common, as in *the, their, them, there, these, they* Inserting *h* for the cipher *p*, we have the line (4), in which "*hen*" comes twice; where are the chickens?

Our next cipher is *r* (16 times), while of the key-letters, *a o i r* and *s* are waiting for a chance. In nine cases this *r* stands alone (its companions being as yet unknown), so that it may be for *a*, *i*, *o*, or almost anything. But in two cases it stands between *t* and *t* and in one case between *t* and *th*, so that it could scarcely have been used for *r s d l c*, or, in fact, for any consonant. For then we would have *trte* or *trthe*, *tste* or *tsthe*, *tite* or *tdthe*, *tcte* or *tcithe*, *twte* or *twthe*, and these are improbable combinations. Is it therefore more probably a vowel, so that we would have either *tate*, *tathe*, *tote*, *tothe*, *tite*, *tithe*, *tute*, *tuthe*, *tyte*, or *tythe*. The most probable of these is *tothe*, and under the form "*to the*" we recognize it as a long familiar friend, whose hand we fondly grasp. Therefore we shall put *o* instead of the cipher *r*, and await results. The first result is shown in line (5).

Next comes cipher *n* (occurring also 16 times). Looking carefully along line (5), we notice nothing very striking till we reach a place where the hypothetical translating already proposed gives us *th the*, and an *n* above waiting to be translated and set into the gap. Evidently,

$n = a$ the only letter that will answer is *a*, making the reading *thatthe (that the)*. Looking again along the line (5), we do not see that putting *a* for cipher *n* will introduce any incongruities, so we write line (6).

We now turn our attention to the cipher *j* (used 15 times), and the earliest unused letters of the list, viz., *i, r, s, d, . . .*

If we put the *i* or the *d* in place of this *j*, we see that we will have at very commencement of the line such monstrosities as *theiene* or *thedene*, but *r* or *s* would fit very well, the result then being *therene . . (there ne . . .)* or *thesene (these ne . . .)*. Having counted up, on this hypothesis, we would have; *r* (or *s*) standing alone four times :

ore	(or ose)	twice.
er	(or es)	twice.
re	(or se)	twice.
ro	(or so)	twice.
or	(or os)	once.
ret	(or set)	once.
there	(or these)	once.

Now between these alternative readings there is very little choice. The difficulty of choosing is occasioned by the very briefness of the cipher message. Had it been an affair of 3000 words, or more, we would almost surely have fallen in with some combination showing clearly to which of the readings preference should be given. As we had not this advantage, we took the *s*, and worked along with it, till we saw it was doing mischief and leading to nonsense. We then turned $j=r$ back, blotted out the *s*, and introduced the *r*, with the result shown in line (7).

Scanning this line closely we see that the first two words must almost necessarily be: "*There never*," and if so, *q* must be translated by *v*.

Making this substitution all along we get line (8), in which $q=v$ we now find "*even*," "*have*," and the curious "*eavore*" and "*avore*." This "*avore*" has just one vacant place before it where the cipher *u* stands. What can fit there? Run through the whole alphabet, and the only possible letter for the place will be found to be either *f* or *s*. The one would give us "*favore*," the other, "*savore*." In either case the word must end in *d*, as "*favored*" or "*savored*." If we put *s* wherever the cipher *u* occurs, we shall have at one place "*assordto*," which can hardly be dissected into sense. Let *s* go, and try $u=f$ *f*, which gives us "*affordto*" (*afford to*). Therefore, cipher $v=d$ *u* is very probably for *f*, and *v* almost certainly for *d*. Having tried them all along the line (9), our hopes are raised at least one full peg.

We notice next that the last cipher-letter of the message is *b*, and we see that its key-letter must be *s*, since nothing else is possible after "*other*." We notice also the recurrence of "*the r*," in four $b=s$ places, and the cipher over the vacant places is *s*; the key

letter, if a vowel, must be *i*, because *a*, *e* and *o* have been already used up; and by trial we find that neither *u* nor *y* would suit for the other places where the cipher *s* is found. Neither would any consonant suit, for then, at a certain place, we would have a combination of five consonants, as "*nd ts*," in which the vacant place is to be filled by any consonant you please. But no such a sequence of consonants is possible in our language. Therefore we must fall back on *i*. Making

s = i the substitutions, cipher *b = s* and cipher *s = i*, we arrive at the result shown in line (10), of which a good part is intelligible, and another part may easily be divined. Thus "*se rets*" can be filled up

only thus "*secrets*," and therefore the cipher *z* was used for *c*.
z = c Next the cipher *x* occurs twelve times; in four places it is
x = l doubled and preceded by *te*; thus we have "*to te their secrets*."
i = m

It requires but little ingenuity to go to *l* for that cipher *x*, and make the reading "*to tell their secrets*." Another incomplete reading now starts up; "*to their ene ies*." The cipher-letter over that vacant place is *i*, and its key-letter is surely *m*. Make now these three substitutions and line (11) is the outcome.

In reading along this line you will encounter "*hidin them*," and it requires no great powers of imagination to put a tail-piece in the shape of a *g*, and get "*hiding them*." In another place, by putting

o = g *g* for the cipher *o*, you will have "*eginning*" which must be
h = b "*beginning*," and hence *h* was the cipher for *b*, giving us line
f = w (12).
d = u

It is unnecessary to argue further. A mere glance at this
c = p line will make it evident that the translations suggested in the
k = y margin (*f = w*, etc., . . .) are the true ones. Supplying these
a = k we have line (13), which only needs word-spacing and punctuation to make it read:

"There never was a time when men could afford to tell their secrets to their enemies, and it seldom happens that they can safely tell them all even to their friends; hence, from the beginning, men have endeavored to find some means of making their secrets known to a favored few while hiding them from all others."

The order of most frequent occurrence, as found in this cipher, differs somewhat from Bailey's, and also from that found in the QUARTERLY.

We place the three together for comparison.

(1) Bailey's: et. aoni. rsh. al. cwum. fygpb. vk. xqjz.

(2) The QUARTERLY'S: et. anio. srh. ld. ucm. fpqwb. vk. (xqjz).

(3) Our cipher: et. nhua. ris. ml. fdwv. cgkpy. bu. (xqjz).

The letters *xqjz* are given as the most rarely used, on the authority of our guide (1), and, curiously enough, they do not occur at all in either (2) or (3). But, in spite of the discrepancies between (1) and (3), still by means of that guide we got a start, and then, by a selective use of "probable," "more probable," and of a large modicum of patience, little by little we found the thing growing onwards towards fitness and sense.

This *simple* kind of cipher-writing may always be deciphered by similar means, provided there is enough of it.

A curious question intrudes itself here. What *kind* of certainty have we that the interpretation given above is correct? Or, better, suppose that we had a whole book printed in cipher, and that, by the means just adopted, we had turned it into good English, readable, connected, sensible; what reliance would we place on the result? The deciphering is founded on a heap of possibilities, if's, perhaps's, probabilities (more or less strong), may-be's, etc., and no single item of certainty in the whole affair. How, then, can the result be certain? And yet you *feel* that it *is* certain, and very certain; and you would condemn a fellow-being, and hang him, on evidence no stronger than this. It has been done time and time again, if history tells the truth. We would feel so certain of the truth of our results, in the supposed case, that should a few discrepancies occur here or there, we would attribute them to an error on the part of the writer, and then proceed to correct the cipher itself. If, on the other hand, the interpretation be not certain, then please tell us what certainty there is in nine-tenths of all the things which we pretend to *know*? We pause for a reply.

"The most famous and complex cipher, perhaps, ever written, was by Lord Bacon," so says a commentator. But let us hear Bacon himself.

"For avoiding suspicion altogether, I will add another contrivance, which I devised myself when I was at Paris in my early youth, and which I still think worthy of preservation. For it has the perfection of a cipher, which is to make anything signify anything; subject, however, to this condition, that the infolding writing shall contain at least five times as many letters as the writing infolded; no other restriction or condition whatever is required. The way to do it is this: First, let all the letters of the alphabet be resolved into transpositions of two letters only. For, the transposition of two letters through five places will yield thirty-two differences, much more twenty-four, which is the number of letters in our alphabet. Here is an example of such an alphabet:

aaaaa stands for	.	.	.	a	abbaa stands for	.	.	.	n
aaaab "	.	.	.	b	abbab "	.	.	.	o
aaaba "	.	.	.	c	abbba "	.	.	.	p
aaabb "	.	.	.	d	abbbb "	.	.	.	q
aabaa "	.	.	.	e	baaaa "	.	.	.	r
aabab "	.	.	.	f	baaab "	.	.	.	s
aabba "	.	.	.	g	baaba "	.	.	.	t
aabbb "	.	.	.	h	baabb "	.	.	.	u and v
abaaa "	.	.	.	i and j	babaa "	.	.	.	w
abaab "	.	.	.	k	babab "	.	.	.	x
ababa "	.	.	.	l	babba "	.	.	.	y
ababb "	.	.	.	m	babbb "	.	.	.	z

Now, suppose you want to inform some one that "All is well." First place down the letters separately, according to the above alphabet:

a l l i s w e l l
 aaaaa. ababa. ababa. abaaa. baaab. babaa. aabaa. ababa. ababa.

Then, take a sentence five times the length in letters of "All is well"—say it is, "We were sorry to have heard that you have been so unwell." Then, fit this sentence to the cipher above, like this :

a l l i s w e l l
 aaaaa. ababa. ababa. abaaa. baaab. babaa. aabaa. ababa. ababa.
 We were sorry to hav e heardtha t you have been so unwell.

Mark with a dot (if the communication is in writing) or italicise (if in print) every letter that comes under a *b*. Then copy out the sentence so marked and send it. The person who receives the cipher writes an *a* under every letter that is not marked, and a *b* under the marked ones. He then divides the cipher so obtained into periods of five letters, looks at his alphabet (*i.e.*, the key), and finds the meaning to be, "All is well."

The "*infolded*" writing in this example is "All is well"; the "*infolding*" is: "We were sorry, etc."

For the above quotation from Bacon we are indebted to Ignatius Donnelly's "Great Cryptogram," p. 506-509.

This cipher is without doubt difficult to be deciphered; for the sake of peace we may even admit that it is "*impossible* to be deciphered"; but does it really "avoid suspicion altogether?" Has it indeed "the perfection of a cipher?" Is it true that there is no restriction in it except that the "infolding writing shall contain five times as many letters as the infolded?" Bacon thought so in his youth, and stuck to it in his mature years, and yet he was clearly mistaken.

The other necessary restriction is, that certain letters in the "infolding writing" be *marked*; and that settles it. Suppose, for instance, that some one had sent to Bacon an epistle containing a number of marked letters, and that this were intercepted and fell into the hands of the sovereign. Bacon would be sent for, and the following dialogue would be held:

Sov.—"Sirrah! what means this letter?"

Bacon.—"Your majesty has read it. Is anything wrong?"

Sov.—"Wrong? Ay, seest thou not these marks?"

Bacon.—"It is a fantasy of the writer, who writes not our language well."

Sov.—"Too well. This is a cipher, and unless thou deliver to me, before the setting sun, the key by which 'tis read, thou goest to the block."

And the upshot is, "tails, I lose; heads, you win."

No, we do not believe there ever was a cipher which was "impossible to be deciphered" and at the same time absolutely "without suspicion" and "easy to read and write."

The "*impossible to be deciphered*" may mean two different things: first, that the cipher cannot be deciphered without the key. In this sense, Bacon's method *may perhaps* give a cipher which cannot be deciphered. It may mean, secondly, that the key itself can be so effectually guarded that it will never fall into unauthorized hands. In this sense

Bacon's method clearly fails, and it is, moreover, exceedingly cumbersome.

Leaving aside the question about its being "without suspicion," which is of little consequence nowadays, we want a cipher which will have the other two "virtues" to perfection. For this purpose we need a key small enough to be carried in the head, and which cannot be discovered by any process of guessing. To write and read it should, moreover, be reasonably easy. We think there is such a cipher; it has existed for a long time, but we have not been able to learn by whom it was invented.

To begin, write out, or, preferably, have printed in good, heavy type, a table, as follows:

TABLE:
TO BE USED IN CONJUNCTION WITH A KEY.

z	a b c d e f g h i j k l m n o p q r s t u v w x y z
y	z a b c d e f g h i j k l m n o p q r s t u v w x y
x	y z a b c d e f g h i j k l m n o p q r s t u v w x
w	x y z a b c d e f g h i j k l m n o p q r s t u v w
v	w x y z a b c d e f g h i j k l m n o p q r s t u v
u	v w x y z a b c d e f g h i j k l m n o p q r s t u
t	u v w x y z a b c d e f g h i j k l m n o p q r s t
s	t u v w x y z a b c d e f g h i j k l m n o p q r s
r	s t u v w x y z a b c d e f g h i j k l m n o p q r
q	r s t u v w x y z a b c d e f g h i j k l m n o p q
p	q r s t u v w x y z a b c d e f g h i j k l m n o p
o	p q r s t u v w x y z a b c d e f g h i j k l m n o
n	o p q r s t u v w x y z a b c d e f g h i j k l m n
m	n o p q r s t u v w x y z a b c d e f g h i j k l m
l	m n o p q r s t u v w x y z a b c d e f g h i j k l
k	l m n o p q r s t u v w x y z a b c d e f g h i j k
j	k l m n o p q r s t u v w x y z a b c d e f g h i j
i	j k l m n o p q r s t u v w x y z a b c d e f g h i
h	i j k l m n o p q r s t u v w x y z a b c d e f g h
g	h i j k l m n o p q r s t u v w x y z a b c d e f g
f	g h i j k l m n o p q r s t u v w x y z a b c d e f
e	f g h i j k l m n o p q r s t u v w x y z a b c d e
d	e f g h i j k l m n o p q r s t u v w x y z a b c d
c	d e f g h i j k l m n o p q r s t u v w x y z a b c
b	c d e f g h i j k l m n o p q r s t u v w x y z a b
a	b c d e f g h i j k l m n o p q r s t u v w x y z a
	a b c d e f g h i j k l m n o p q r s t u v w x y z

across till he strikes "z;" at the top of this column he sees "k," the second letter of his text, and so on to the end.

Of course, after copying out his cipher-message, the sender will destroy the key-word and the text, *i.e.*, all evidence of the process by which the cipher was built up; and the receiver should do the same on his part. "Dead men do not tell any tales," neither do burnt manuscripts.

What are now the advantages of this system of cipher-writing? Mainly the following:

1. This cipher is quite easily written and read—much more so, indeed, than most others which we have seen.

2. It is concise, since every letter counts; there is no padding or dead weight in it.

3. The key-word need not—indeed, should not—be kept in writing. It can be kept in the head, and need never be changed. The "table" reveals nothing.

4. We believe this cipher cannot be deciphered. This point deserves examination.

The recurrence of the same cipher-letter for the same text-letter does not take place here except accidentally, and an accidental coincidence furnishes no clue. In the short example given above "i" in the text becomes "l" in the cipher at one place and "k" at another. Also, "n" becomes now "z," now "q"; "a" becomes "c," and afterwards "t"; "e" becomes "r" and "z," and, by pure accident, "r" and "z" again; "w" is replaced by "j," by "i," by "j," and by "z." Had the message been longer, each letter of the text would have been represented by a still greater variety of cipher-letters. A queer case arose in the beginning of a sentence which we were trying with a different key-word. The resulting cipher was the eleven letters: "x x x x x x x x x x."

Now, sorely-tried reader, what would you do with that? It is a genuine cipher, but we would be willing to risk the fortunes of all our nearest relatives that no one can ever decipher it without the key. Please try.

The method of deciphering made use of on pages 868, 869, is, therefore, absolutely useless for this kind of cipher-writing. It is this continual shifting of the value of each letter of the key-word, baffling, as it does, all attempts at anything like systematic conjecturing, that gives this cipher its chief virtue, and renders it, we may say, undecipherable. If it can be deciphered at all, it can only be by finding out the key-word by *pure* guessing. What chances are there of succeeding in that?

Those of you who have the misfortune of being rich make use, doubtless, of a safe having a "combination lock." If there are 50 numbers on the knob, and three combination wheels within, the chances of any one's guessing your combination are as 1 to 50³, or as 1 to 125,000. Under these conditions you feel that your valuables are safe, at least from any attempt to get at them by guesswork.

Now, the cipher we have been considering consists of 26 letters, and if the key-word is as long as "Columbus" (8 letters), the chances of guessing that key-word would be as 1 to 26⁸; that is, as 1 to 208,845,344,016. Is that safe enough?

If not, take as key-word a sentence of say 16 letters. The chances will then be as 1 to 43,616,377,717,161,387,008,256, and, on our part, we would be content with that.

But if one were determined to have the very highest degree of safety from the "table" as we have given it, he need only take a line of 26 letters from some obscure poet (there are plenty of them), write each word of the line backwards, and use the sequence of letters so obtained for his key-word. He could not forget the line of poetry, and by using it as directed the chances of discovery would become as 1 to 6,157,736,328,465,319,832,910,113,650,084,560,896.

To any one who can grasp the meaning of *six undecillions*, even leaving out the small fry that follows, this ought to be conclusive, and we therefore think that unless some new means be discovered of finding out the key, this method of cipher-writing gives us a practically undecipherable cipher.

Since the above was written we have come upon a review of a new work on cryptography, entitled "L'Art de Chiffrer et Déchiffrer les Dépêches Secrètes," par le Marquis de Viaris. . . . Paris, 1893. 175 pp. 8vo.

This "Art of Cipher-Writing and of Deciphering Secret Despatches" is, the reviewer tells us, a critical examination of about everything that has been written on the subject from time immemorial.

The Marquis of Viaris also explains a new method, invented by himself, which consists in the simultaneous use of six hundred alphabets. These alphabets are obtained by systematic permutations of the ordinary alphabet. The author claims that his cipher is absolutely undecipherable. It ought to be, and one would be tempted to imagine that it would be, at the same time almost absolutely un-write-able; but of this we cannot judge until the work has found its way across the ocean.

T. J. A. FREEMAN, S. J.

NOTE ON THE LIFE-SAVING SERVICE.

SINCE the July number of the REVIEW was published, some new statistics, concerning the work of the "Life-Saving Service," have come to light. We place them side by side, with the results already given, in order to show that the gallant band is still at its post, and doing its duty as nobly as ever:

	1889-90.	1890-91.	1891-92.
Property endangered,	\$7,617,435	\$7,020,805	\$8,352,335
" saved,	5,510,945	5,783,960	7,174,475
" lost,	\$2,106,490	\$1,236,845	\$1,177,860

	1889-90.	1890-91.	1891-92.
Lives endangered,	3523	3531	2923
“ saved,	3475	3481	2896
“ lost,	48	50	27
Proportion saved.	Per cent.	Per cent.	Per cent.
Property,	over 72 $\frac{1}{4}$	nearly 82 $\frac{1}{3}$	nearly 86
Lives,	nearly 98 $\frac{2}{3}$	nearly 98 $\frac{2}{3}$	over 99

As we shall not have occasion to return to this subject, we give, as a final medal of honor, the condensed record for the last twenty-one years, *i.e.*, from 1871 to 1892 :

Property endangered,	\$104,710,319
“ saved,	78,821,457
“ lost,	\$25,888,862
Proportion saved,	over 75 per cent.
Lives endangered,	52,843
“ saved,	52,216
“ lost,	627
Proportion saved,	nearly 99 per cent.

We leave all comment to the meditations of our benevolent readers.

T. J. A. FREEMAN, S. J.

Book Notices.

THE PHYSICAL SYSTEM OF ST. THOMAS. By *Father Giovanni Maria Cornoldi, S. J.* Translated by *Edward Heneage Dering*, translator of "On Universals" and "Political Economy," etc. London and Leamington Art and Book Company. New York, Cincinnati and Chicago: Benziger Bros. 1893.

Speaking of the corrupting influences of positivism and materialism manifested in the teaching of the Italian school, the author adds: "If in our Catholic schools the physical sciences were *rightly* and *fully* taught the evil would be *less*." This is a very profitable thought and applies not only to Italian schools but also to most of the public and private (non-Catholic) schools of our own country. In the schools referred to positivism and materialism are fully entrenched and are continually and subtly undermining the very foundation of faith. The author further adds, in effect, that many who have a great reverence for the wisdom of the Angelic Doctor and declare without hesitation their adherence to his doctrines know too little of the fundamental questions that belong to physics. Hence, many have confused ideas about these questions, and are, therefore, liable to be deceived by the sophisms and the authority of men who pass as wise and learned in such things. Hence, also, the necessity to place before the public, and especially the Catholic public, the principles of the physical system certainly upheld and strongly advocated by St. Thomas. How applicable to our own country and the present time! Protestant institutions of learning, the popular literature of the day, the secular press—all abound in pseudo-scientific instruction and information. Our Catholic people must necessarily come in contact with this false teaching whether of the school, of books or of the press. The issue must be met, and the true will overcome the false. If Catholic educators (we use the term in its most general sense, including the clergy and all other leaders of Catholic thought) would seriously consider the tendencies of modern thought in this one respect, namely, the effect of present scientific training upon our *own* people I think a new impetus would be given to the study of science, and that from the highest Christian standpoint available.

NATURE.—Chap. iv., p. 21.

Passing over the preliminary discussion of the *Materia Prima* and *Substantial Form* for the reason that it may be considered too abstruse for the general public, though essential for a thorough understanding of the rest of the work, yet, perhaps, our present idea may be sufficient for what follows. You can scarcely hear a lecture on any scientific subject or read any book treating of the same without hearing or seeing nature spoken about as if it (she) were a sentient, intelligent being. How common such remarks as these: "It is a wise provision of nature," "Nature adapts means to ends," "Beneficent nature," etc. Ask the lecturer to define nature, and mental confusion ensues. It is very necessary to have clear ideas of nature, the very opposite of indefiniteness. If there were no other reason, the Catholic definitions concerning man and, above all, concerning the Divine Word Incarnate ought to be sufficient (p. 27). St. Thomas gives no uncertain sound. His definition is full and complete. "Nature is the first principle of motion and of

rest." This may not seem at first either full or complete. A careful study of chap. iv., however, will be found convincing. At least, let us away with attributing to nature an intelligent personality.

ATOMS.—Chap. vi., p. 37.

The Present Atomic Theory.

All material substances are composed of *minute* particles called molecules. These molecules possess the qualities and properties of the mass of which they are a part. Molecules are *divisible* into smaller particles called atoms. Atoms are *indivisible*, and are the ultimate particles that enter into chemical union. Atoms cannot exist in a free state, that is uncombined. Molecules can exist free, uncombined. Another definition of molecule is: a molecule is the smallest particle of matter that can exist by itself. For example, a molecule of iron is the smallest particle of iron can exist as iron.

You will observe in the above brief abstract of the atomic theory no attempt to explain the inherent properties or qualities of either molecule or atoms, no attempt to show why it is that they act as they do; there is no accounting for *life*. All is bare and crude and a confession of ignorance. Even the distinction between the atoms of organic or inorganic substances is ignored. Indeed, there has been a feeble attempt to show that there is *no* difference.

Now, contrast the modern atomic theory with that of St. Thomas. The Angelic Doctor in effect says the atom is *indivisible* but not necessarily *minute*. It (the atom) has individuality; its indivisibility is not absolute but relative (read p. 37.). Therefore, an individual corporeal substance is continuous, consequently an atom. *The human soul is the substantial form of man*. It cannot in itself be divided or separated. Now, coupling the above with St. Thomas's idea of *Materia Prima* and the Creation his definition not only includes organic but inorganic atoms and the *principle of life*. The trouble with modern scientists has been to account for life and intelligence. With a grand flourish of trumpets they announce that they have proved beyond a question the indestructibility of matter and force; hence no necessity for a creator. When they are asked to explain the existence of *intelligence*, there is a great silence. We have sometimes questioned men who stand high as scientific leaders, "Is intelligence potential in matter or something superadded to it?" The subject is generally dropped right at this point.

Professor Tyndall intimates in one of his lectures that life and intelligence may be potential in matter. This is his illustration. Most persons residing in the Torrid Zone have never seen water in its solid condition, that is, crystalline. These persons are perfectly familiar with liquid water and have some knowledge of gaseous water, but talk to them of solid water and they were amazed. Yet let some of the water in their immediate locality assume the gaseous form and be wafted to the northward at a certain distance from the Torrid Zone, and at a definite temperature the polar or crystalline forces will come into action, and that water which was gaseous now descends in the beautiful crystalline form of snow. This crystalline form was undoubtedly potential in the water in the Torrid Zone. So, perhaps, life and intelligence may be potential in matter, but at present beyond our ken.

The above is Tyndall's idea in our own language, and is the very best attempt at the answer to the question to the materialist, "Whence life and intelligence?" To such extremes are they forced. Another

thought in connection with this subject ; most persons of even ordinary education who have given the matter any consideration at all have concluded that the idea of conservation of energy, of potential and dynamic force is peculiarly the discovery of recent times. The enunciation of this doctrine has been heralded far and near as one of the most important principles of modern physical science. Let us consult St. Thomas, p. 18 ; " Some things that are not may be, and some already are. That which may be, but is not, is said to be *in potentia*. That which already is, is said to be *in actu*. The being of a thing is two-fold—essential or substantial, such as being a man, etc."

One cannot read the above quotation in full without perceiving that St. Thomas not only had the very clearest concept of potential and dynamic operations of force or energy, but he also gives this idea a scope far, very far, beyond the modern idea. A scope which must sooner or later be enunciated by modern lights. This may happen even in our day. It certainly will be given prominence in Catholic teaching.

ATTRACTION.—Chap. ix., p. 69.

The writer has often said to his friends that one of the most mysterious of natural phenomena (in one sense all natural phenomena are mysterious) is the attraction existing between a magnet and iron. We have held the iron some distance from the magnet yet within the magnetic field. We have measured the *pull* of the magnet at this distance. We have varied the distance and thus discovered the law of the attraction. We have interposed various substances between the magnet and the iron and yet the pull—the attraction as strong as ever. We have used strong electromagnets placed against the inner wall of the lecture room and the attraction acting through the mortar and the brick has held large masses of iron against the outer, the exterior wall of the building. Matter thus seems to act *where it is not*. We have said, gentlemen, here is a *fact*, explain it who can ; *we cannot*. We call it magnetism but we are not out of the difficulty. We have only *named* it. What is magnetism ? What is attraction ? This was the state of our mind till we read chap. ix. I am amazed to find that this attraction, the explaining of which has baffled so many learned men of the nineteenth century, was so clearly apprehended by St. Thomas and so conclusively elucidated. Verily we moderns need to sit at his feet and learn first our own ignorance, then in simplicity and faith apprehend the wisdom of the Angelic Doctor. After defining *immanent* and *transient* action and clearly distinguishing between the two, after illustrating completely the mode of action of *animate* and *inanimate* matter, after demonstrating the action of the soul on and in man, the author says : " Therefore it is *easy* to conceive how a body even though *inorganic* can in virtue of its *own* substantial form be transported from one place to another" (p. 73). " Since the order and beauty of the corporeal universe depends on the *reciprocal* operations of corporeal substance and these cannot operate without *approaching* ; therefore to all of them, an *inner* inclination is given called universal gravitation by which they tend towards each other."

ETHER.—Chap. xxi., p. 170.

Behold now another of the vaunted results of modern research, the modern theory of luminiferous ether.

Theory of To-day.

It has been proven by numerous experiments in the propagation of

waves of sound through various media that the velocity of these waves is directly proportional to the square root of the *elasticity* of the medium and inversely as the square root of the density of the medium. The enormous velocity of the waves of light (185,000 miles per second) are therefore only possible in a medium which is almost *infinitely* elastic and at the same time almost infinitely *rare*. Further, it cannot be attenuated air or gas, since the waves of light pass without retardation through the most complete *vacuum* which we can produce. Scientists therefore have recourse to the concept of a medium of extreme elasticity and tenuity which is supposed not only to fill interplanetary but also intermolecular space, and this medium they call *ether*. Without this hypothetical ether the phenomena of light are *inexplicable*.

Let us consult again St. Thomas. On reading page 170 you will perceive that the idea of an ether filling interplanetary space is *not* a modern idea. The old scientists saw clearly the necessity for this hypothetical ether and they defined its existence mainly on account of the same needs and for nearly the same reasons as advanced at the present time. There are *now* difficulties in this hypothesis. Only a short time since I read a pungent article by Prof. Cooke of Harvard College, concerning these very difficulties. Now these very same objections were *known* and *admitted* by St. Thomas. The angelic doctor admitted the existence of the ether, judged light to be *not* a substance (in this respect in advance of the emission theory upheld by Newton), believed light to be a *quality* (see his definition of qualities of matter), derived from the luminous body in the ether and that the ethereal medium is necessary for seeing the object *far* or *near*. He further alleged that ether transmitted *heat*. In this connection read the conclusion on page 176.

LEHRBUCH DER THEORETISCHEN PHILOSOPHIE. AUF THOMISTISCHER GRUNDLAGE.
Von Dr. *Virgil Grimmich*, Benediktiner von Kremsmünster, Professor d. Philos. and. Theolog. Hauslehranstalt zu St. Fabian. Freiburg in Breisgau. Herder'sche Verlagshandlung. 1893. Received from Herder, St. Louis. Pp. xv., 565. Price, \$2 75.

It is much to be regretted that Dr. Grimmich did not make the Latin instead of the German language the vehicle for bringing his course of philosophy before the general public. We do not believe that even students having a command of German will profit as much by his work in its present garb as if it had been given them in the original medium of Thomistic thought. Certain it is that no reader who is not thoroughly conversant with scholastic Latin can understand any single section of the book, for its terminology is generally expressed in Latin, or Germanized Latin, whilst its pages bristle with citations from the original works of St. Thomas and the other great schoolmen. On the other hand, had the course been published in Latin it would have been of service to a very much larger class of readers than is able to profit by it in its present dress, and would have received that universal recognition which it deserves. As it is, we must content ourselves with welcoming an excellent text-book of which a very limited number of students can make use.

The work on the whole follows the ordinary lines and matter of the Neo-scholastic philosophy, with here and there an exception. The treatise, for instance, on Method, embracing Definition, Division, Demonstration, finds very properly a place in Material instead of Formal Logic, and Noetics is interposed between Methodology and Critique, the latter subject making the last section of Material Logic. A very useful,

and altogether original, section of Noetics is given to show how the foundations of Logic, Metaphysics, Ethics, Æsthetics rest upon the scholastic theory as to the genesis of human knowledge. In vexed questions, for example, that which regards the nature of the distinction between Essence and Existence in creatures, the author adheres firmly to the Thomistic teaching, which is apparently that of St. Thomas.

Dr. Grimmich is too thoroughly a philosopher not to realize that the old philosophy must offer a radical solution to the problems raised by the new science. He is therefore careful to show how the peripatetic theory as to the essential constitution of material substance, when rightly interpreted, is quite in harmony with, nay complementary to, the teaching of the physical sciences.

Darwinism, pure and simple, he of course refutes, but he contends that a theory of evolution which maintains immanent potentiality and finality, together with God's administrative providence, is well in accord with the mind of St. Augustine and St. Thomas. Another excellent feature of the book is a very full glossary explaining the scholastic terminology with special reference to the body of the work.

All students of philosophy who have the mastery of its language will find this manual of genuine service. Though much condensed, clearness is in no wise sacrificed to brevity. The contents of St. Thomas's philosophy are well elaborated, whilst numerous references to cognate literature point the way to larger gleanings.

SELECT WRITINGS AND LETTERS OF ATHANASIUS, BISHOP OF ALEXANDRIA.—
 Edited, with Prolegomena, Indices, and Tables, by Archibald Robertson,
 Principal of Bishop Hatfield's Hall, Durham, late Fellow of Trinity College,
 Oxford.

This forms the fourth volume of the "Select Library of Nicene and post-Nicene Fathers," under the editorial supervision of Drs. Schaff and Wace. The labor of editing St. Athanasius has been committed to very competent hands. Mr. Robertson deserves great praise, not only for the labor and devotion bestowed upon his task, but also for the care and respect with which he has treated the previous labors of Cardinal Newman in the same field. Referring to Newman's translations of the Four Discourses against the Arians, which he incorporates, Mr. Robertson observes: "The copious and elaborates notes and discussions which accompany it, have always been acknowledged to be a masterpiece of their illustrious author. The modern reader sits down to study Athanasius, and rises from his task filled with Newman. Like all the works of Newman included in this volume, translation and notes alike have been touched by the present editor with a reverent and sparing hand. The translation, which shows great care and fidelity, coupled with remarkable ingenuity and close study of characteristic phrases and idioms, has been, with two exceptions, but little altered. These exceptions are: (1) the substitution throughout of 'essence' for 'substance,' (2) an attempt to remedy the most unfortunate, though not unconsidered, confusion of γεννητός and γενητός under the same rendering, 'generate.' A good rendering for the latter word and its cognates is indeed not easy to find; but it was felt impossible, even in deference to so great a name, after the note in Lightfoot's *Ignatius*, to leave the matter as it stood."

We draw attention to this passage, not for the purpose of entering into the merits of a subtle distinction, which concerns the general parlance rather than Newman, who took the words as he had found them—but

in order to show our author's "hesitation in touching, even to this slight extent, the works of John Henry Newman." The confidence thus inspired in Mr. Robertson's wise conservatism, is increased by the religious tone of his remarks throughout, and by his evident sympathy with his saintly hero's doctrine and character. Flaws may be noticed here and there, especially wherever the obnoxious Papacy comes within the field of vision; but this is always discounted in the work of an Anglican. All that can be demanded of a Protestant translator is that he give us the pure text of the ancient Fathers with the care and fidelity of a Newman, and not overburden it with his subjective views. It is an immense advantage to the Catholic controvertist to be able to quote the Fathers in the vernacular through the medium of a Protestant translation. This is especially the case when the translation has been so carefully and ably made as in the present instance. We therefore give the work the heartiest of welcomes, and pray that it be extensively read and studied.

ELEMENTS OF ECCLESIASTICAL LAW. By Rev. S. B. Smith, D.D. Vol. I. Ecclesiastical Persons. Ninth Edition. New York: Benziger Bros.

The fact that nine editions of this book have appeared since 1877 is a sufficient proof of its excellence. If the work were one of general interest such a demand would be very complimentary, but when we consider that its patronage is limited to ecclesiastics, we must be convinced that only real excellence could create such a demand. The work has been improved with each edition. The highest recommendations that can be given to any work have been given to this one in its former editions. A theologian to whom the late Cardinal Newman presented it for examination thus sums up its excellencies: 1. It gives just what is necessary for our times and circumstances. 2. It follows the best order and form, placing the common law of the Church first, and then the special law, and following the catechetical form. 3. It quotes the best authorities; it has been examined by Cardinal Simeoni's consulters; and it has been corrected and improved at their suggestion. 4. Its value is much increased by frequent reference to the *Schemata Vaticanæ Concilii*, on proposals made by bishops to bring about a revision of the *Corpus juris*. 5. It is not tiresome, as manuals or handbooks generally are, but on the contrary it is very interesting. As the author says, in his preface to the ninth edition: "Since the last edition of this work was published, a most important event has taken place in this country. We allude to the establishment of the apostolic delegation. . . . Hence we have thought it opportune to set forth in this new edition . . . the origin and history of apostolic delegations; their various kinds; their powers and prerogatives: their support and maintenance: the recall, resignation, etc., of apostolic delegates, auditors and secretaries; and the office of the auditor, and of the secretary of the apostolic delegation."

This edition also contains a very important decision of the S. C. de Prop. Fide in regard to ecclesiastics assigning to laics pecuniary claims against other ecclesiastics, for the purpose of bringing suit in the secular court for the recovery of the claim.

In addition, the author has more accurately defined the powers of the College of Cardinals during the vacancy of the Papal chair.

The information which this edition contains on apostolic delegations is full, clear and timely, and it is valuable for all the faithful—laity, priests, and bishops. The silly blunders that are continually being made by otherwise well-informed journals when speaking of the apos-

tolic delegate, and the ridiculously false assumptions of the numerous correspondents who think they know it all, move us to say to them: Buy a book.

THE BLESSED VIRGIN IN THE FATHERS OF THE FIRST SIX CENTURIES. By *Thomas Livius, C.S.S.R.*, with a preface by His Eminence, the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Brothers. 1893.

"Whatever value may be attached to this work," says the learned author, "is due entirely to the numerous patristic extracts which it contains. It has not been my general aim in it to prove or expound the various points of Catholic doctrine regarding Our Lady, which form the subject-matter of the several chapters; but rather simply to show what were the views and teachings of the Fathers on them, and to produce their own words in witness. Hence the quotations from the Fathers should be looked upon as the principal part of this work, and what I have written of my own as but accessory." In other words, Father Livius has here done for Mary that which he had so successfully accomplished for St. Peter; he has by means of copious and lengthy extracts from the writings of the Fathers enabled the English reader to judge for himself what were the sentiments of the early Church. Hence his goodly-sized volume is destined to become what His Eminence of Westminster prophesies, "a standard book of reference." In thirteen chapters he allows the Fathers to give their views on "Mary as the second Eve," on her sanctity, her sinlessness, her virginity, her analogy to the Church, her intercessory power and the miracles and graces obtained through invoking her. The second chapter, concerning her place in patristic exegesis of Scripture, evinces wide and careful reading. Very wisely, the author has placed St. Ephrem apart by himself, a just tribute to the exceptional merit of that great servant of the Mother of God. In four introductory chapters, the author has given a lucid exposition of the doctrine of development, carefully distinguishing between *accretive* development, or new revelations, which ceased with the first promulgation of the Gospels, and *non-accretive* development, which is a clearer understanding of the full bearing and conspectives of the truths once revealed to the Church, and which can never cease, so long as the Church (to use Cardinal Vaughan's words) "like Mary in the Gospel, is ever pondering in her heart over the things she has heard."

But it would not be right to take the author's modest estimate of his labors too literally. His work is far more than a catena of patristic texts. His marshalling of witnesses displays remarkable skill; and his introductory remarks are replete with learning and wisdom. We join with Cardinal Vaughan in thanking the disciple of St. Liguori and in trusting that his book "will meet with the cordial reception which it deserves from devout Catholics, on the one hand, and from sincere and earnest inquirers outside the Church, on the other."

MANAGEMENT OF CHRISTIAN SCHOOLS. By the Brothers of the Christian Schools. New York: P. O. Shea, Publisher. 1893.

The above little work is an essay drawn up for the use of schools under the management of the Christian Brothers. The object of the work, the preface tells us, is, "first, to determine and specify the method and system to be followed in schools taught by the Christian Brothers; and, second, to enable the teachers to become acquainted with methods which, having stood the test of experience, may be advantageously used

in the discharge of their duties." The publication of this little work is timely, and will, we are sure, meet with general approbation. The work of the Christian Brother in the field of education has been splendid and far-reaching, and great good therefore must result from the publication of a system which has been the instrument of such splendid achievements. Though old, formulated as it was so long ago by the saintly founder of the Christian Brotherhood, the system of education as explained in the present work and carried out in daily practice in the school-room is abreast of the latest methods of modern times. As with the systems of education used in other schools, so the system used by the Christian Brother has discarded the old lines that sought chiefly the cultivation of the memory and makes use of methods chiefly calculated to exercise the understanding and lead the child to reflect and reason upon facts. This, it is now very generally admitted, is the truest and best system. The wonder is that long ere these times men did not see this.

Apart from the explanation of the Christian Brothers' system of education and method of instruction, the little book before us is valuable for the direction and guidance it gives to the teacher. This we hold to be a very important feature in the work of education. A teacher's deportment and bearing is a very prominent factor in the work of instruction, a factor, indeed, to which the greatest concern and care should be given. Together with the imparting of knowledge, the teacher is ever, consciously or unconsciously, forming character. His example, his bearing, his words and deeds are ever shaping and moulding the minds and hearts around him. Hence the importance of care and of right views and high standards in that regard.

To all those, then, who are interested in the work of education, and to those especially who are wedded to the noble work of instruction, we heartily commend this little book. It may tell them nothing that is new, but its thoughtful suggestions and high standards cannot fail to do them good.

SATURDAY DEDICATED TO MARY. From the Italian of Father Cabrini, S. J. With Preface and Introduction by Father Clarke, S. J. London: Burns & Oates, Limited, 1893.

Though misleading, if the title given to this book be instrumental in inducing others, as was the case with the reviewer, to secure it, we are sure they will never regret it. When first our eye fell upon the title we fancied the work a dry and long drawn out disquisition on the origin of and reasons for the dedication of Saturday to the Blessed Virgin. We were, however, on opening its pages, agreeably surprised to find our thoughts at fault. We found the book not a dry and prolonged essay on the origin of and reasons for the dedication of Saturday to the Blessed Virgin, but a fresh and delightful devotional work on the Blessed Mother.

In saying that we were agreeably surprised to find that the title of this book had misled us, we do not mean to cast disparagement upon, much less to discourage or undervalue, studies and works of the nature indicated or implied by the title. To such studies we all should give our heartiest and most practical approval and encouragement. They are indeed worthy of highest commendation, resulting, as in most cases they do, in new incentives to devotion and new reasons for faith and love. The agreeableness of our surprise arose rather from the unusual excellence of the devotional work than from a direct and positive dislike for a subject implied by the title. In his introduction to the work, Father

Clarke gives what we consider a very reasonable explanation of the dedication of Saturday to the Blessed Virgin. Citing other reasons and explanations given by most eminent and most pious writers, he holds and sustains his opinion by strong authorities; that as Friday was already occupied by considerations of the Sacred Passion of Jesus, the devotion of the faithful to the sufferings of His Holy Mother because of that Passion was naturally transferred to the following day.

We commend this book, on devotion to the Blessed Mother, to both clergy and laity. It has a freshness and originality of treatment that must appeal to the delight of all Catholics. The author divides the work into fifty-two considerations, as he calls them. Each consideration is in reality a sermon with three points, and will, we are sure, be greatly prized by our clergy, who will find in these considerations, with slight development, rich material for their instructions to the people.

THE CHRISTIAN'S LAST END; OR, SERMONS ON THE FOUR LAST THINGS: DEATH, JUDGMENT, HELL, AND HEAVEN. In seventy-six Sermons, adapted to all the Sundays and most of the Holy Days of the year, with a full index of all the sermons, an alphabetical index of the principal subjects treated, and copious marginal notes. By the *Rev. Father Francis Hunolt*, Priest of the Society of Jesus, and Preacher in the Cathedral of Treves. Translated from the original German edition of Cologne, 1740, by the Rev. J. Allen, D.D., Missionary Priest, Queens-town, South Africa. Vol. I. and II. Benziger Bros., Printers to the Holy Apostolic See. 1893.

There are, we feel sure, very few priests who have not in their libraries, and within easy reach of their desk, the preceding volumes of Father Hunolt's great work, as given us in their English translation by Dr. Allen. That "The Christian's Last End," the ninth and tenth volumes of the series, will meet with a generous and general welcome, we are firmly convinced. The subject-matter—Death, Judgment, Hell, and Heaven—the great foundations and truths of Christianity, is of intensest interest and first importance. And where nowadays are those questions treated as in the sermons of Father Hunolt? We do not claim for them, for to such things they make no pretension, elegance of diction or ornateness of style; they do not appeal to the ear by the rhythm and stateliness of their sentences, but have they not that which is far more excellent? Where a simplicity of statement, a depth, a liveliness of faith, an unction, a fervor of piety, as in these sermons? In these days of fastidious delicacy, when skepticism has become fashionable, when the very names of hell and judgment have been relegated to the background, when even in the Christian pulpit there is so much trimming, so much cowardice, it does one good to meet their like. They preach Christ. They reach out for the salvation of souls. You feel there is conviction and sincerity back of them, and you are touched and moved. These are the sermons that go to the heart of man and raise him from sin and inspire him to do and dare great things for God. We commend them to priest and people. To both they will prove a wondrous treasure.

MEDITATIONS AND DEVOTIONS OF THE LATE CARDINAL NEWMAN. New York and London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1893.

The publication of this volume will surprise not a few persons. It is a revelation of a side of Cardinal Newman's character of which the public generally knew very little. They knew him as an acute and profound thinker, as a learned controversialist and historian, and as an ascetic and pious ecclesiastic; but only those who knew him most intimately, most interiorly, we may say, knew that even when seemingly he

was entirely engrossed with other occupations and studies, he was devoutly meditating and praying.

Yet such was the fact, as numerous papers of his, mostly incomplete and fragmentary, clearly show. The volume before us is made up of those of his prayers and meditations which he had fully written out. That they are of superior merit goes without saying. Every one who knows anything about Cardinal Newman knows that this could scarcely fail to be true of everything he wrote.

It only remains for us to briefly recount the contents of this incomparable work. Part first contains Meditations on the Litany of Loretto, for the month of May, a Memorandum of the Immaculate Conception, which for simplicity of argument and lucidity of reasoning is unsurpassable; a Noneva of St. Philip, and a Litany of St. Philip. Part second contains Meditations on the Stations of the Cross; Meditations for Good Friday; a Prayer for the Faithful Departed, and Litanies, respectively of Penance, the Passion, the Seven Dolours, the Resurrection, the Immaculate Heart of Mary, the Holy Name of Mary, of St. Philip (in English and in Latin), and an admirable translation of "*Anima Christi*"; a short service for Rosary Sunday, and a number of Meditations on different subjects, and of Prayers for different purposes. Part third consists of twenty-three Meditations on Christian Doctrine, and a concluding paper written by Cardinal Newman in prospect of death.

FROM THE HIGHWAYS OF LIFE. New York: The Columbus Press, 1893.

The purpose of this little volume is to show how converts are made. The purpose is well carried into effect. There are accounts of all kinds of converts who differed widely from one another in their dissent from the Catholic faith, who approached it from different directions, and from all sections of the regions of doubt and error; they were, severally, Jews, "Anglo-Catholics" or Ritualist High Church Episcopalians, Low Churchmen, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Unitarians, Baptists, Methodists, white people and colored people, of various characters, pursuits and positions in society.

The accounts of these conversions, the compiler assumes us in his preface, are authentic, both in fact and in authority. Each one of the accounts was written by the convert himself or herself, except a few which were written by friends at the request of the converts. With one exception, the subjects of these narratives are not our most distinguished converts nor are they from the ranks of the uneducated and ignorant. There is little of controversy and didactic teaching in these sketches. They are more like narratives of explorers and travellers, for they tell of the journeys of the converts on the byways and highways that lead to truth.

The reader will note that the heroic part of the progress of these converts towards the truth and their final acceptance of it, was not so much repugnance to the faith itself, as in surmounting difficulties of a personal nature, such as alienation from family and dearly loved kindred and friends. In this respect, as in other respects, the experience of these converts do not materially differ from those of most other converts.

The book is not only interesting, but valuable to Catholics, by showing through a number of practical object-lessons how to help men and women into the Church. It is shown the invincible influence of soul upon soul in propagating the truth—a burning word, a generous sacrifice, a noble life.

JOHN SEBASTIAN CABOT; Biographical Notice, with Documents. By *Francesco Torducci*. Translated from the Italian by *Henry F. Brownson*. Detroit: H. F. Brownson, Publisher. 1893.

It was a happy thought that led Dr. Brownson to translate and publish Torducci's work on John and Sebastian Cabot; for, as discoverers, the two Cabots rank above all others except Columbus. Torducci, indeed, in some respects places them along side of, if not above Columbus. He says that John Cabot preceded Columbus in the attempt at transatlantic discovery, and that although San Salvador was discovered nearly two years before Cabot discovered those parts of North America which subsequently England took possession of, yet Cabot would have succeeded had Columbus never lived.

But this in reality amounts to nothing. John Cabot preceded Columbus in the attempt at transatlantic discovery, but his attempt was fruitless. Moreover, Cabot preceded Columbus because Columbus was prevented for many years, by want of sufficient means, from entering upon the realization of his scheme. Otherwise Columbus would have preceded Cabot in the attempt at discovery, as he did precede him in planning the attempt. To say that had Columbus never lived, Cabot or some one else would have made the discoveries Columbus made—is true; but it is childish thus to reason. As well say that if Sir Isaac Newton had not made the notable scientific discoveries he did make, some one else would have made them.

As for the work itself, it shows the same painstaking collection of materials, and the same carefully discriminating, judicious employment of them, that characterize the author's work on Columbus.

CATHOLIC SCIENCE AND CATHOLIC SCIENTISTS. By the *Rev. J. A. Zahm, C.S.C.*, Professor of Physics in the University of Notre Dame. Philadelphia: H. L. Kilner & Co. 1893.

This work is composed of articles, revised and enlarged, which originally appeared in the AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW and in the *Ave Maria*. Its object is to show the relation of the Church to science; that there is not, and cannot be, a conflict between real science and true religion, and that those who have been guided by the light of faith and Christian philosophy are precisely those who have been most successful in the pursuit of knowledge and have contributed most towards securing valuable results in every department of science.

This purpose the learned writer successfully accomplishes in the four chapters or papers which make up the volume, and which are respectively entitled "Science and the Church," "Catholic Scientists and their Achievements," "Catholic Dogma and Scientific Dogmatism," "The Friends and the Foes of Science."

MORALPHILOSOPHIE. Eine wissenschaftliche Darlegung der sittlichen, einschliesslich der rechtlichen, Ordnung: von *Victor Cathrein, S. J.* Second enlarged and revised edition. B. Herder: Freiburg and St. Louis. Two volumes in large octavo. Price, \$5.85 net.

We congratulate the learned Jesuit and the cause of Christian ethics upon the remarkable success of this great work, as evidenced not only by the fact that the first edition, issued in 1890, has been so speedily exhausted, but yet more by the universal applause of the Catholic world and the expressions of bitter enmity evoked from unchristian moralists. At the first appearance of the volumes, the Catholics recognized that a new and powerful champion of religion had arisen among

them ; one who, planting himself firmly on the " wisdom of St. Thomas," was furthermore thoroughly acquainted with the living questions of the hour, and able to apply the ancient truths to the solution of modern problems. Those so-called philosophers, on the other hand, who amuse themselves by undertaking to " make bricks without straw," viz., to build up a system of ethics to the exclusion of God and religion, have been extremely restive under the inexorable lash of the author's logic, which has taken them *nominatim*, and exposed the futility of their dreams. The numerous alterations and additions made in this second edition are all in a line with the author's main object of following up the sophisms of irreligious teachers and exposing the fallacy of their ethical theories. We can only repeat a wish, often expressed by us when dealing with Herder's valuable publications, that the treatise may be speedily translated for the benefit of English readers.

MAGISTER CHORALIS. A Theoretical and Practical Manual of Gregorian Chant for the use of the Clergy, Seminarists, Organists, Choir Masters, etc. By *Rev. Dr. F. X. Haberl*, Director of Church Music School Ratisbon, editor of the complete works of Palestrina, etc. Second (English) edition, translated from the ninth German edition by *Most Rev. Dr. Donnelly*, Bishop of Canca, Vicar General of Dublin. Ratisbon, New York and Cincinnati. Fr. Pustet, 1892. London: Burns & Oates.

With the former English edition of this work issued about ten years ago, ecclesiastics generally are familiar. We do not hesitate to say that the present edition, taken from the improved ninth German edition, will give more satisfaction, and for the reason chiefly that the translator has adhered more faithfully to the German original. The order of compilation and treatment is about the same as in the first edition. Beginning with a history of plain chant, the author divides the work into three parts.

In the first part he treats of sounds, intervals, notes, clefs, rhythm, pronunciation, and those other elementary principles whose knowledge is essentially necessary to success in music. In the second part the author treats first, of the nature of the old Gregorian modes, their employment in simple choral chant ; and secondly of the Church calendar, of the arrangement and use of the several liturgical books and of the domain of Catholic Gregorian church music in general. The third part of the work the author devotes to general considerations and principles for the execution of plain chant and an inquiry into its spirit and intimate connection with Divine worship.

BRENDANIANA, ST. BRENDAN THE VOYAGER IN STORY AND LEGEND. By the *Rev. Denis O'Donoghue, P.P., Adjert.* Dublin: Browne & Nolan, 24 and 25 Nassau Street. 1893.

It is a great pity that so little, in a positive authentic way, is known of St. Brendan. Of his birth and early life we have exact knowledge. We know that he became a most holy man, founded schools and monasteries in his native land, and, filled with the Apostolic spirit, went forth to other countries and spread the Gospel among their inhabitants. But of his voyages by sea, of the lands he visited and the peoples he met we have little more than story and legend. That the saint found his way to America is not improbable. It were rash, we hold, to deny it, though at present we have no positive proofs to bear out the opinion. The future no doubt will throw light upon that early period of the Christian era. For centuries it was unknown that the Northmen had discovered

Greenland in the tenth century, and not until the early years of the present century was that fact made known. So too we trust will the future historian be able to do justice to the labors and sacrifices of Brendan. Whilst furnishing nothing, in a positive way, that is new to the scholar and general reader, "*Brendaniana*" will, we are sure, give delight to thousands of hearts in the old land by its portrayal of the local labors and life of the saint. To many, moreover, its pages on "*Vestiges of Prehistoric Settlements and Missions*" will be both interesting and instructive.

MEMOIRS OF CHAPLAIN LIFE. By *Very Rev. W. Corby, C.S.C.* Chicago: Lamonte, McDonnell & Co. 1893.

A member of the Faculty of Notre Dame University, Indiana, has in these memoirs produced one of the most interesting records of personal experience that we have met with for a long time. For three years chaplain of the famous Irish Brigade of the Army of the Potomac, he had an exceptional opportunity to take notes of his adventures and experiences which have enabled him to give, nearly thirty years after the close of the war, a vivid and life-like narrative of some of the most thrilling incidents in our great internecine struggle. Father Corby has succeeded admirably in giving a realistic account of every-day life in the army, and has recorded, chronologically, incidents exactly as they occurred under his notice, without tedious prolixity of detail. Besides his own experiences he gives those of fellow-chaplains and others, in reference to which he says:

"I give a valuable account, written by Father Egan, of his own experiences and labors. Finally, an able article from the gifted pen of my friend and 'companion-in-arms,' Major-General St. Clair A. Mulholland, of Philadelphia, recounts the chivalry of the soldiers, and especially of the Irish soldiers, who won imperishable glory in the defense of right on innumerable battlefields."

His object in presenting this book to the public has been, he says, "to show the religious feature that existed in the army. In the presence of death religion gives hope and strength. The Christian soldier realizes that his power comes from the 'God of Battles,' not from man."

DONN PIATT; HIS WORK AND HIS WAYS. By *Charles Grant Miller*.

POEMS AND PLAYS. By *Donn Piatt*.

SUNDAY MEDITATIONS AND SELECTED PROSE SKETCHES. By *Donn Piatt*. Cincinnati: Robert Clark & Co. 1893.

It is well to record the life and preserve the literary remains of men whose life and labors have had a lasting influence for good on their country. Such was certainly the fortune of Donn Piatt, the son of a pioneer lawyer and judge in Ohio, who had become a convert to Catholicity in 1820, though his son's life was not without its storms and shadows. It was necessarily so at times, for his lot was cast among scenes of great political turmoil and confusion, the strife of civil war and official corruption in high places. The story is told sympathetically and interestingly from his birth in a pioneer home until his edifying death in the bosom of the Catholic faith.

Some of the best literary efforts are preserved in the two volumes of remains, though combined with them are other productions by no means so meritorious. It would have been better had the introductory essay of the "*Sunday Meditations*," which we take to be the editor's, been

omitted, it being only a tirade against common school education and the pretensions of science. In regard to the latter subject, indeed, it contains at least one proposition that has been formally condemned by the Church.

THE LIFE OF ST. PETER CLAVER, S.J., THE APOSTLE OF THE NATIONS. Edited by a Father of St. Joseph's Society. Philadelphia: H. L. Kilner & Co.

In the history of the Church we read of heroic souls giving themselves as slaves in exchange for Christian captives, but Peter Claver's task was different. He was on the Western Continent when the accursed slave traffic was prosecuted with utmost vigor and with relentless cruelty. His mission was to these poor slaves. Surely it was a unique vocation. No sympathy, no encouragement were his; nothing but open hostility or ill-disguised contempt. For forty years he labored among the slaves, consoling and instructing them teaching, them patience, fortitude, forgiveness of their cruel oppressors, converting them to the true faith. His labors and his success were marvellous, and his miracles were stupendous.

The story of his life and labors, of his success, his miracles, his sanctity, his death, are well-told in the volume before us.

RELIGIOUS PROBLEMS OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY. Essays by *Aubrey de Vere, LL.D.* Edited by J. G. Wenham. London: St. Anselm's Society. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1893.

The first three of the essays contained in this volume are selected from Mr. de Vere's Essays in three vols., published by Messrs. Macmillan; the last two originally appeared in the *Dublin Review*. The subjects discussed are those with which our own times are most immediately and profoundly concerned. They are treated with a thoroughness and completeness that must powerfully appeal to the right reason and good sense of those who are troubled with honest doubts and real difficulties. They go to the root of the matters discussed; and, if read with care, can scarcely fail to enlarge the minds and enlighten the eyes of many who do not wish to be unbelievers, yet are drifting about in the waters of speculation, not knowing which way to go, or what to do.

LETTERS AND WRITINGS OF MARIE LATASH; Lay-Sister of the Congregation of the Sacred Heart. With Critical and Expository Notes. By two Fathers of the Society of Jesus. Translated from the French by *Edward Healy Thompson, M.A.* Vol. II. London: Burns & Oates, Limited. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Bros.

From more than one point of view this is a peculiar book, and calculated to attract attention. Its contents, it is claimed, were made known to the writer by our Lord Himself. Be that as it may, they are worthy of perusal and study for their own sake, for their wholesomeness, and the deep, abiding faith of the writer.

The chapters on "Grace," on "Sin," and the "Four Last Things" we found particularly interesting and instructive.

THE LABORS OF THE APOSTLES: THEIR TEACHING OF THE NATIONS. By the *Right Rev Louis de Goesbriand, D.D.*, Bishop of Burlington. New York, Cincinnati: Benziger Brothers. 1893.

After a brief chapter describing the public life of our Divine Lord, the author points out the means which the Blessed Redeemer appointed

for perpetuating and disseminating His doctrine. Then the author shows how the New Testament came to be written, the progress made by the gospel, the mission and labors of St. Paul, the Apostolate of St. Peter, his office as Head of the Church, and then traces out the labors of the other Apostles.

The work is a valuable contribution to the literature already existing on these subjects.

THE WITNESS OF THE SAINTS; OR, THE SAINTS AND THE CHURCH. By *Henry Sebastian Bourden* London: Burns and Oates. New York, Cincinnati and Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1893.

This book is a reprint of a "Popular Introduction" to an edition of Butler's "Lives of the Saints," which is now being issued in numbers by Messrs. Virtue & Co., of London, England. In five successive chapters the author shows that the saints are our teachers, that they are champions of unity, examples of holiness, pledges of Catholicity, and heirs of the Apostles. The treatment of the several subjects is judicious; the examples cited and the incidents narrated are well calculated to illustrate and enforce the author's statements.

PLAIN PRACTICAL SERMONS By *Rev. John A. Sheppard, A.M.* Fr. Pustet, Printer to the Holy See and the Sacred Congregation of Rites. New York and Cincinnati: Fr. Pustet & Co. 1893.

After a careful reading we pronounce these sermons just what the author claims for them; they are plain, practical sermons, instructive and convincing. Here and there we could wish for more directness of treatment, perhaps a little more simplicity, but taking them all in all, they are solid thoughtful sermons.

We trust that Father Sheppard will go on in this field, and soon again give us in a new series of sermons the fruits of his labors.

A LADY. MANNERS AND SOCIAL USAGES. By *Lelia Hardin Bugg*, Author of "The Correct Thing for Catholics." New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers, 1893.

There is no other country in the world where there are so many persons asking what it is proper to do, and where there are so many who are sincerely anxious to do the proper thing, as in the United States. To all these, this little book will be invaluable. Its suggestions and directions are sound, judicious, and sensible. Every one who follows them will be, so far at least as manners and external behavior go, a true lady.

"AS THE BISHOP SAW IT" FROM AMERICA TO ROME. Edited by *Very Rev. Frank A. O'Brien*. Pauly, Fuchs & Co.: Detroit, Mich.

This book consists of letters written by the Right Rev. C. H. Borgess, D.D., late Bishop of Detroit, describing what he saw in Rome, and also in other places in Italy, Switzerland, Germany, Holland, Belgium, France, England, and Ireland, during an extensive tour through those countries. The letters are just what the title of the work suggests—chatty, lively, interesting descriptions of what the Bishop saw in the different places he visited.

THE DAYSPRING FROM ON HIGH. Selections arranged by *Emma Forbes Carey*. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1893.

These selections for every day in the year are made from the Sacred Scriptures, and the productions, both in poetry and prose, of many dif-

ferent distinguished writers. In making her selections, the author has exercised great care and discrimination. The result is an interesting and instructive volume, and one which may be daily consulted with interest and profit.

TABULÆ SYSTEMATICÆ ET SYNOPTICÆ TOTIUS SUMMÆ THEOLOGICÆ JUXTA IPSAM MET DOCTORIS ANGELICI METHODUM STRICTIUS ET CLARIUS EXACTÆ. By P. J. J. Berthier, Editio Altera. Friburgi Helvetionum, Sumptibus Veith Bibliopolæ Universitatis. 1893.

This will be a welcome publication to all students of St. Thomas. To the student entering on the study of the Angelic Doctor it must prove the greatest assistance; whilst to those who have become familiar with the writings of the Saint, it will be invaluable, calculated as it is to fix in the memory the matter gone over.

SHORT SERMONS ON THE EPISTLES FOR EVERY SUNDAY IN THE YEAR. By *The Very Rev. N. M. Redmond, V.F.* 1893. Fr. Pustet, Printer to the Apostolic See and the Sacred Congregation of Rites. Fr. Pustet & Co. New York and Cincinnati.

Excellent little sermons! That was our verdict on closing the above book after a careful perusal of its contents. They are the sermons, plain, direct and eminently practical, we should like to see in the hands of the people. They are brief, perhaps too much so in the minds of some, but they nevertheless contain a great deal. We like them greatly.

CHRIST IN TYPE AND IN PROPHECY. By *Rev. A. J. Maas, S. J.*, Professor of Oriental Languages in Woodstock College, Md. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago; Benziger Brothers. 1893.

This work has reached us too late for careful examination and notice; and both the importance of the subjects treated and the distinguished reputation of the author for learning and ability forbid any other kind of notice. We hope to do justice to its merits in the next number of the REVIEW.

WHY, WHEN, HOW, AND WHAT WE OUGHT TO READ. By *Rev. J. L. O'Neil, O.P.* Boston: Thomas B. Noonan & Co. 1893.

A really admirable book, and one which every young person ought to have, and read. Indeed, its suggestions are not only useful to the young, but even scholars of mature age may obtain from it profitable instruction.

AN EXPLANATION OF THE GOSPELS OF THE SUNDAYS AND HOLY-DAYS. From the Italian of Angelo Cagnola by *Rev. L. A. Lambert, LL.D.* Together with an Explanation of Catholic Worship, its Ceremonies, and the Festivals of the Church. From the German by *Rev. Richard Brennan, LL.D.* With 32 illustrations. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1893.

This is one of the most useful and instructive books on the subjects mentioned on its title page that we know of.

THE RELIGION OF SCIENCE. By *Dr. Paul de Corus.* Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Society.

This is a pretentious little volume, thoroughly sophistical and false from beginning to end.

BREVIARUM ROMANUM: Ex decreto SS. Conc. Trid., etc. Four vols., 18 mo. Fifth edition. Ratisbon, New York and Cincinnati: F. Pustet.

A very convenient edition of the breviary, containing all the latest offices, with legible type, and, owing to the lightness of the paper on which it is printed, each volume weighing less than a pound.

GOD'S BIRDS. By *John Priestman*. London: Burns & Oates, Limited, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers.

The birds which are treated in this book under the name of "God's Birds," are the birds mentioned in the Bible. The work is both instructive and interesting.

AN OCTAVE TO MARY. By *John B. Tabb*. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co.

This volume (which as regards its paper, letter-press, and binding is a work "*de luxe*") consists of a number of devout meditations in verse on the Ever Blessed Virgin Mary.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

THE SCIENCE OF MECHANICS. A Critical and Historical Exposition of its Principles. By *Dr. Earnest Mach*, Professor of Physics in the University of Prague. Translated from the Second German Edition by *Thomas J. McCormac*. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company. 1893.

THE FLIGHT INTO EGYPT. From the Meditations of Sister Anne Catherine Emmerich. Translated from the French by *George Richardson*. London: Burns & Oates. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers.

THE MONTH OF THE HOLY ANGELS. *St. Francis de Sales*. From the French. Approved by His Eminence, Cardinal Gibbons. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1893.

GOLDEN PRAYERS. Containing the Ordinary of the Mass, Vespers, Benediction of the Most Blessed Sacrament, etc., etc. New York, Cincinnati, and Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1893.

FROM LA RABIDA TO SAN SALVADOR. A Drama in Four Acts. By a member of the Congregation of the Sisters of the Holy Cross. Notre Dame, Ind.: Office of the "Ave Marie."

AN EXAMINATION OF WEISMANNISM. By *George John Romanes, M. A., LL.D., F. R. S.* Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company. 1893.

IN DREAMLAND, AND OTHER POEMS. By *Thomas O'Hagan*. Toronto: The Williamson Book Company. 1893.

LA RABIDA. A California Columbian Souvenir Poem. By *Mary Lambert*.

FIRST PRAYERS FOR CHILDREN. New York: Benziger Brothers.

PERIODICAL

70751

DOES NOT CIRCULATE

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

